

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 973

CG 026 267

AUTHOR Kofodimos, Joan R.
TITLE Beyond Work-Family Programs: Confronting and Resolving the Underlying Causes of Work-Personal Life Conflict.
INSTITUTION Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, N.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-1-882197-05-4
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 78p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Creative Leadership, P.O. Box 26300, Greensboro, NC 27438-6300 (\$25 plus \$4 shipping).
PUB TYPE Books (010) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Employee Assistance Programs; Employee Attitudes; *Employer Employee Relationship; *Family Work Relationship; Industrial Psychology; Industrial Structure; Job Satisfaction; Organizational Climate; Organizational Development; *Quality of Working Life; Work Attitudes; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS Organizational Analysis; *Organizational Culture

ABSTRACT

Work-Family Programs (WFPs) are among the most popular and publicized workplace innovations of the 1990s. These programs are intended to alleviate employees' work-personal conflicts by addressing issues such as child care assistance, parental leave, elder care, flexible working arrangements, wellness and fitness, and stress management. The problem is that WFPs are not working very well. Most programs are not widely used and their presence spurs reactions from indifference to resentment among many organizational members. This is because organizations are primarily concerned only with the symptoms, not the fundamental causes, of work-personal life conflict. WFPs could be more effective if they were framed around a context of a balance-supportive culture. An organization's culture must shift from a mastery orientation and support each of the three aspects of work-personal life balance: time-and-energy distribution across life areas; collaborative-connected leadership; and self-realization. The document also includes a list of Work-Family Programs, a collection of organizational assessment tools, and sample interventions toward a balanced culture. (Contains 48 references.) (JE)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

CENTER FOR CREATIVE LEADERSHIP

BEYOND WORK-FAMILY PROGRAMS

CONFRONTING AND RESOLVING
THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF
WORK-PERSONAL LIFE CONFLICT

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN
GRANTED BY

M. HOROWITZ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

Joan R. Kofodimos

BEYOND WORK-FAMILY PROGRAMS

CONFRONTING AND RESOLVING
THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF
WORK-PERSONAL LIFE CONFLICT

BEYOND WORK-FAMILY PROGRAMS

CONFRONTING AND RESOLVING
THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF
WORK-PERSONAL LIFE CONFLICT

Joan R. Kofodimos

Center for Creative Leadership
Greensboro, North Carolina

The Center for Creative Leadership is an international, nonprofit educational institution founded in 1970 to foster leadership and effective management for the good of society overall. As a part of this mission, it publishes books and reports that aim to contribute to a general process of inquiry and understanding in which ideas related to leadership are raised, exchanged, and evaluated. The ideas presented in its publications are those of the author or authors.

The Center thanks you for supporting its work through the purchase of this volume. If you have comments, suggestions, or questions about any Center publication, please contact Bill Drath, Publication Director, at the address given below.

Center for Creative Leadership
Post Office Box 26300
Greensboro, North Carolina 27438-6300



©1995 Center for Creative Leadership

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher. Printed in the United States of America.

CCL No. 167

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Kofodimos, Joan R.

Beyond work-family programs : confronting and resolving the underlying causes of work-personal life conflict / Joan R. Kofodimos.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 1-882197-05-4

1. Work and family. 2. Quality of work life. 3. Family. 4. Organizational behavior. I. Title.

HD4904.25.K64 1995

658.3'82—dc20

95-10667

CIP

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	vii
Preface	ix
Introduction	1
WFPs Today: Their Rationale and Their Problems	2
Stated Reasons for Using WFPs	2
Reducing barriers to productivity	2
Gaining public relations and recruitment advantages	3
Responding to demands of a diverse employee population	3
Reacting to regulations and mandates	4
Problems WFPs Encounter in Practice	4
Lack of energy from senior management	4
Avoidance by career-oriented employees and stigma for users	4
Supervisor resistance	5
Perception that WFPs are not adding value	5
Mixed results in helping women	5
What Do the Reasons and Problems Tell Us?	6
Why Current WFPs Don't Work	6
The Mastery Orientation Underlying Work-Personal Life Conflict	6
Time-and-energy focus on work	7
Competitive-control approach	8
Self-idealization	9
How WFPs Reinforce Mastery Orientation	10
WFPs support work as the primary life priority	11
WFPs are designed and implemented using a competitive-control approach	11
WFPs reinforce self-idealization	12
How Mastery Orientation Explains WFP Problems	13
Executives' mastery orientation biases them against WFPs	13
Willingness to focus on work is used to separate executives and high- potentials from others	14
The competitive-control management approach is too limited to administer WFPs	14
Individual success is defined according to mastery-oriented criteria	15
WFPs make women's commitment to personal life more salient	15
Further implications of the Band-Aid effect	15
Unrecognized Costs of the Mastery Orientation Which WFPs Disguise	17
Focus on work leads to crisis and burnout	17
Competitive-control approach to leadership leads to disempowerment, flawed decisions, and unsurfaced dissent	21
Self-idealization leads to careerism and optimizing personal agendas	21

Creating Organizations Which Support Life Balance	23
Key Elements of a Culture Supporting Life Balance	24
Time-and-energy distribution across life areas	24
Collaborative-connected leadership	24
Self-realization	24
Interventions Towards a Balance-Supportive Culture	25
Assessing the level of mastery orientation and the organizational and individual costs	25
Demonstrating to members the costs of mastery orientation	26
Clarifying purpose and vision for balance	26
Providing individual coaching for mastery-oriented executives	27
Determining areas of misalignment with balance and implementing aligned balance-oriented practices	27
Implementing supplemental WFPs as needed	30
Barriers to Balance	30
Resistance from mastery-oriented executives	30
The assumption that life balance and organizational effectiveness are incompatible	30
Authoritarian assumptions regarding organization functioning	31
Pressure from prevailing culture	31
Conclusion	31
References	33
Appendix A: Work-Family Program Database	35
Appendix B: Organizational Assessment Tools	41
Assessment 1	43
Assessment 2	44
Assessment 3	45
Assessment 4	46
Assessment 5	47
Assessment 6	48
Assessment 7	50
Appendix C: Sample Interventions Towards the Balanced Culture	53

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank Tim Hall, Lisa Horvath, Martha Hughes-James, Sharon Lobel, Chuck Palus, and Faith Wohl for their helpful feedback on an earlier version of this paper. Special thanks go to Kyle Dover for his collaboration in developing the model of a balanced culture and the interventions towards balance.

Preface

These days, we hear a lot of discussion about the increased desire for work-personal life balance. As a result, work-family programs are gaining currency; in the popular press one can frequently read articles advocating these programs. Many people believe that work-family programs reflect a change in fundamental values regarding the relationship between work and personal life, a shift away from the overemphasis on work at the expense of personal life. In this paper, however, I will suggest that work-family programs, in spite of all the good intentions behind them, are actually a product of the value system they seem to be trying to change and that, as a result, they cannot accomplish their intended purpose of enhancing individual well-being and organizational productivity.

This conclusion is the result of a long-standing interest in the issue of work-personal life balance and more than ten years of research and consulting with individuals and organizations on this issue. During this time I have investigated questions such as these: How does work come to take over individuals' lives? Why are individuals who have attained external symbols of success in their careers often dissatisfied with the state of their personal lives? Why does it often take a crisis for executives to re-evaluate imbalanced life structures?

I first formulated a conceptual framework of work-personal life imbalance in my doctoral dissertation. This was a biographical case study focusing on the forces in one executive's *character* (personality and psychological processes) and his *life history* which affected how he managed the balance between his work and personal life, how he approached the relationships and activities in his personal life, and how his approach to personal life paralleled his approach to work (Kofodimos, 1986). As I was developing these ideas, I became involved in a research study looking at how executives' character affected their leadership behavior (Kaplan, Drath, & Kofodimos, 1991). We conducted approximately forty intensive clinical studies of individual senior executives participating in a process of feedback and coaching to boost their effectiveness. I found that the patterns in my dissertation participant's character were shared by many executives in this larger sample. The additional data allowed me to expand and refine the conceptual framework and to propose an explanation for why many executives' lives get out of balance. This explanation emphasized the inner psychological forces which shape executives' life structures and contribute to work-personal life imbalance. Correspondingly,

my practice emphasized individual coaching and counseling of executives. My purpose was to help them gain insight into those inner forces driving them to focus on work, and to use that insight in personal development which would support behavior changes aimed at greater life balance.

In more recent years I began to explore the role of organizational culture and values in reinforcing work-personal life imbalance. I investigated the systemic forces contributing to imbalance among senior managers in two professional firms and worked with these firms to design and implement interventions to support increased balance. I have also worked with several organizations on large-scale cultural and structural change issues including empowerment, work process redesign, workforce diversity, and strategic alignment. Through this work, I have learned to approach organizations as whole systems; I have seen the ineffectiveness of piecemeal change projects. I have approached the balance issue from other perspectives, at times while explicitly addressing some other issue such as leadership development or self-managing work teams with implications for the life balance of organization members.

This evolution of research and practice recently culminated in the book *Balancing Act: How Managers Can Integrate Successful Careers and Fulfilling Personal Lives* (Kofodimos, 1993). This work presented a conceptual framework which explained work-personal life imbalance as the result of deeply rooted psychological and organizational forces. I also provided strategies for individuals who wanted to change their lives and the cultures of their organizations.

As I was completing *Balancing Act*, I began hearing more and more about work-family programs. At first, I welcomed this information as an indication that there were positive steps being taken to correct imbalance. But, over time, as I was exposed to many organizations' work-family programs and had the opportunity to witness their impact firsthand, my opinion of their efficacy began to change. The programs I observed did not address what my research had found to be fundamental issues and cultural forces leading individuals to sacrifice their lives for their jobs. I became even more skeptical as I saw work-family programs begin to receive negative publicity regarding various problems in their effectiveness—problems which were predictable within the framework of my research. My doubts about work-family programs and my conviction that my research could help explain why such programs were failing was the genesis of the investigation into work-family programs which is reported here.

My purpose in writing this paper is to assist those individuals and organizations who seek to bring about both life balance and organizational effectiveness. I define life balance as a satisfying, healthy, and productive life which includes work, play, and love; which integrates a range of life activities with attention to self and to personal and spiritual development; and which expresses a person's unique wishes, interests, and values. I believe that life balance can enhance organizational effectiveness when individual and organizational goals are properly integrated. I also believe that work-family programs have the potential to be important components in organizational cultures that support balance, and my intent is to help these programs and their champions reach that potential.

Introduction

Work-family programs (WFPs) are among the most popular and publicized workplace innovations of the 1990s. These programs are intended to alleviate employees' work-personal life conflicts by addressing issues such as child care assistance, parental leave, elder care, flexible working arrangements (for example, flextime and job sharing), wellness and fitness, and stress management.

Different stakeholders hold different goals for WFPs. Some are concerned with WFPs' potential contribution to organizational outcomes, such as enhancing productivity and satisfying stakeholder demands. Others are more concerned with individual outcomes, such as reducing barriers to nontraditional employees' career progress and improving the quality of life for all employees. The existence of these programs is a tangible acknowledgment of the seriousness of the conflict between work and personal life, and the challenges this conflict poses for individual well-being and organizational effectiveness. The problem is that, according to either of these criteria, WFPs are not working very well. Current programs provide some assistance to some people. However, most programs are not widely used, and their presence spurs reactions from indifference to resentment among many organizational members.

What are the reasons for this underutilization and what are the causes of this disproportionately adverse reaction? Most of the answers to these questions can be found in an analysis of reports (see next section) about the rationale for and implementation of WFPs. These reports suggest to me that organizations are primarily concerned only with the symptoms, not the fundamental causes, of work-personal life conflict. In this paper, I will assert that WFPs could be more effective for both individuals and organizations if they were reframed around a broader context of creating a balance-supportive culture. Such a reframing would require organization members to confront what my research has identified as fundamental causes of work-personal life conflict.

This paper is intended for two audiences, which I will refer to as policy-makers and champions. By policy-makers I mean senior managers who are considering implementing WFPs or who already have them in their organizations. By champions I mean human resources managers, work-family managers, work-family consultants, or any individuals who design and advocate WFPs.

In the first part of this paper I offer a model of WFPs as they are currently constituted, including the reasons organizations use them and the difficulties they encounter in doing so. In the second part I show how these difficulties can be explained by understanding WFPs to be focusing on symptoms, while failing to address the deeper forces which underly work-personal life conflict. I also discuss the ongoing costs of these underlying forces. In the third part I describe key elements of a balance-supportive culture and provide guidelines for making the shift to a workplace that will both support work-personal life integration and enhance organizational effectiveness.

WFPs Today: Their Rationale and Their Problems

I recently reviewed the available literature on WFPs and did a content analysis of 106 articles, a sample that includes case studies, prescriptive models, and empirical research. (See Appendix A for a list of these articles.) The following information is derived from my analysis.

WFPs, as they are currently formulated and implemented, tend to be used by organizations for a common set of stated reasons and to encounter a common set of problems.

Stated Reasons for Using WFPs

The reasons that organizations give for using WFPs fall into two categories: expected organizational benefits and institutional pressures which require a response (Goodstein, 1994). Expected benefits include reducing barriers to productivity and gaining public-relations and recruitment advantages. Institutional pressures include responding to demands of a diverse employee population and reacting to regulations and mandates. I will discuss each of these reasons separately.

Reducing barriers to productivity. WFPs aim to cut down on such problems as lost time (Estess, 1993), absenteeism (Matthes, 1992), and turnover (Covin & Brush, 1993) by removing the forces that keep employees away from work or prevent them from devoting their full attention to work (Eichman, 1992). For example, an employee who has to care for an aging and ill parent may spend work time on the telephone, may have to take long lunches or breaks to transport the parent, may have to take a sick day to attend to the parent, and ultimately, if the organization is inflexible in response to these needs, the employee may have to seek a more supportive

work situation elsewhere. If the organization provides assistance such as flexible work options or an information and referral service for elder care, that employee is liberated to focus more time on work, the time spent at work is more likely to be productive, and he or she is more likely to stay on the job. This saves the organization from having to invest in hiring and training a new employee (Galen, 1993a; Shalowitz, 1992a); it also relieves them of paying the individual for on-the-job time spent worrying about and addressing personal life problems (Klein, 1991).

WFPs can also more directly reduce costs and thus improve net productivity. For example, by shifting some employees to part-time status, the organization can reduce pay and benefits correspondingly. Similarly, by granting unpaid parental leave, the work burden can be shifted to current employees or to cheaper contract labor (Martinez, 1993).

Gaining public relations and recruitment advantages. Another reason for implementing WFPs is that they can be a high profile public relations (Collins & Magid, 1989) and recruitment (Woolsey, 1992) tool. Companies with cutting-edge WFPs are frequently cited in magazines, particularly on best-company lists such as those in *Working Woman* and *Working Mother*. This exposure can be extremely valuable in attracting potential employees and customers (Gilbert, 1990). Not only do WFPs demonstrate that the organization cares about its employees, but they provide services that many people require in order to accept a job (Shalowitz, 1993).

Responding to demands of a diverse employee population. WFPs are often described as a response to the increasing demographic diversity of the population from which the current and future workforce will be drawn (Duxbury, Higgins, Lee, & Mills, 1992). By now almost everyone in organizations knows that the composition of the workforce has changed, and is increasingly composed of such groups as women, single parents, and members of dual career couples. Few families these days fit the traditional nuclear model in which the husband is the sole wage earner and the wife takes charge of child care and household management; so, there is no longer a designated family member with the time to manage all personal life responsibilities (Woodruff, 1990). In order to survive and compete, organizations must develop programs and policies that meet the needs of new employees and that therefore enable them to work productively (Otto, 1992; Tarrant, 1992). Thus the users of many WFPs are considered to be members of these nontraditional populations. Such employees have become educated through the media about the potential services available through such programs; and they, as well as

the professional and trade associations that represent them, have actively lobbied for the implementation of WFPs (Lee, 1991).

Reacting to regulations and mandates. Since the early 1980s the federal government has attempted to encourage private-sector organizations to become more involved in work-family issues, particularly child care. In 1981, the Economic Recovery Tax Act created opportunities for employers to gain tax advantages by providing child care assistance for their employees (Goodstein, 1994). Sometimes legislative mandates even force organizations to implement WFPs (Phillips & Bramson, 1990). For example, the recently enacted Family and Medical Leave Act makes it mandatory for employers of over fifty people to provide up to twelve weeks of unpaid leave for child care and other family and personal needs (Galen, 1993b).

Problems WFPs Encounter in Practice

The sample of published articles on WFPs listed in Appendix A describes a number of difficulties that have been reported by those who have tried to implement such programs: lack of energy from senior management; avoidance by career-oriented employees and stigma for users; supervisor resistance; the perception that WFPs are not adding value; and mixed results in helping women.

Lack of energy from senior management. Senior managers may pay lip service to WFPs because they are currently seen as a hallmark of a progressive and socially responsible management, but they usually will not push hard for their implementation or utilization (Schachner, 1991; Woolsey, 1992). They typically argue that, since they themselves never had these supports, others should be able to succeed without them (Hall, 1990). And, they believe that WFPs encourage mediocre employees to remain with the organization (Lee, 1991).

Avoidance by career-oriented employees and stigma for users. WFPs do not get used as much as champions might hope. One study of eighty companies with flexible work arrangements found that few employees used these options (*Workplace flexibility*, 1993). In most organizations, the majority of users are female (Schachner, 1991), and of those women most are clerical employees (Christensen, 1990). Other employees report that they are afraid to make demands or express their needs because they might jeopardize their jobs (Braus, 1992). The figures suggest that male employees with work-family concerns rarely use WFPs (Deutschman, 1991; Falkenberg, Monachello, & Edlund, 1991). Other research indicates that when male employees take a break from work to attend to a personal-life responsibility,

they often do so on the sly (Gibbs, 1993). For example, they may claim they are going to an off-site meeting when they are actually going to a child's soccer game (Hall, 1990).

Supervisor resistance. WFPs often are resisted by those who are expected to implement them—supervisors of WFP users. For example, a supervisor often is expected to be the one to grant an employee leave time or approve an alternative work arrangement. Supervisors complain that such policies are difficult to administer equitably (Flexible work schedules, 1990). They feel that taking each employee's personal life considerations into account, perhaps having to create a unique approach for each employee's specific situation, requires extra effort that would be better spent managing the actual work (Austin, 1994). They fear that all employees will simultaneously want to take advantage of their rights to personal time, or that they will be accused of discrimination if they give some employees special treatment (Geber, 1993). And if such special treatment is given, some would rather be able to give it as they have in the past, as a favor which they can dispense or withhold according to their own prerogative (Verespej, 1992).

Perception that WFPs are not adding value. There is little evidence on the actual impact of WFPs on productivity (Gonyea & Googins, 1992). However, managers concerned with balance sheets argue that WFPs cost too much without delivering in terms of productivity (Shelley, 1992). WFPs are included in the current concern about the escalating cost of employee benefits (Shalowitz, 1992a). WFPs are often among the first things to be cut when economic pressures increase (Galen, 1993a).

In addition, many people see WFPs as intruding on areas that are and should remain outside the purview of business. Many potential users avoid WFPs because they do not view their needs as legitimate organizational issues (Cramer & Pearce, 1990). The underlying belief is that business is not responsible for, or even capable of dealing with, workers' family problems (Cordtz, 1990). The only relevant issue in the workplace should be getting the job done.

Mixed results in helping women. Recent studies suggest that companies that have implemented WFPs partly to help female employees succeed are not getting the expected gains in percentage of women managers. In fact, many companies without WFPs are doing better than many companies with WFPs in terms of promoting women (Sharpe, 1994). There is some fear among women managers that the use of WFPs can harm their career progress, although research suggests that the actual impact is less harmful than perceived. A recent study found that WFPs have more negative effects on

women's careers when supervisors and corporate culture are not supportive (Schwartz, 1994).

What Do the Reasons and Problems Tell Us?

The reasons cited for starting WFPs and the problems encountered in implementing them begin to give us clues into why they are failing or are, at best, much less effective than many advocates had hoped. As we have seen, their purpose is not to resolve the conflict between work and personal life, but rather to alleviate the effects of that conflict in order to respond to stakeholder pressures and profitability considerations. The problems WFPs are encountering suggest that dealing with the piecemeal effects of work-personal life imbalance is ineffective and that, to become more effective, WFPs will need to address deep-rooted cultural forces.

Why Current WFPs Don't Work

By identifying current difficulties with WFPs, I am not suggesting that we should do away with WFPs or that WFPs are not addressing a real need. Some of the benefits of WFPs are important to many people who use these programs. However, the heart of my argument is that current WFP strategies are self-defeating because they seek to address the conflict between work and personal life at the symptomatic level and thus neglect what I see as the fundamental forces which cause the conflict—a set of psychological patterns and cultural values which equate self-worth with hard work, a confident demeanor, and career success. Also, the programs themselves are designed and implemented in ways that reflect and reinforce these patterns and values, thus perpetuating the work-personal life conflict. As a result, WFPs may actually be leading to the unintended consequence of disguising deeper causes and more serious costs.

The Mastery Orientation Underlying Work-Personal Life Conflict

The theoretical views described in this section are derived from a long-term research program with the goal of understanding and addressing the psychological and cultural forces underlying work-personal life conflict (Kofodimos, 1993). The research focused on (1) the psychological processes of managers and executives who have been successful according to organizational criteria and (2) the cultural patterns of their organizations. As a result of this research, I have come to understand executives' psychological pro-

cesses and organizations' cultural patterns as mirror images of each other. Together, they compose a paradigm which I call the *mastery orientation*. This orientation is characterized by a time-and-energy focus on work, a competitive-control approach, and self-idealization. Table 1 summarizes the elements of the mastery orientation. I will describe each of these elements as my research has led me to understand them.

Time-and-energy focus on work. Many professionals, managers, and executives who have attained success and received rewards in their careers struggle to give even half as much attention to their personal lives. They wish that they had more time to spend at home, that their personal lives were more fulfilling, and that they could find a way to structure their lives differently without penalty, but they seldom act on these wishes. Meanwhile, they have problems with marriages, children, or health—while often denying that these problems exist. This denial is shattered when the problems erupt into major crises, such as broken marriages, health problems including early heart attacks, or emotional difficulties in children. These individuals frequently claim that they are pressured to focus on work by organizational demands.

Table 1
Elements of the Mastery Orientation

	Time-and-Energy Focus on Work	Competitive- Control Approach	Self- idealization
Psychological Processes	Individuals focus their time and energy on work	Individuals com- pete and strive for control, and avoid collaboration and connectedness	Individuals seek to live up to an idealized image of self to gain esteem
Cultural Patterns	Organizations promote im- balanced focus on work as produc- tive and virtuous	Organizations promote competitive/ control-based leadership profile as most effective	Organizations promote idealized image, channel personal development towards organi- zational ends

But they eventually reveal that they do so because they enjoy working and value the rewards and recognition they get from their work.

Organizational reward systems and norms encourage this focus on work. Managers and supervisors tend to believe that the employees who devote their lives primarily to their jobs are the best and most committed employees. A recent study of male MBA graduates (Schneer & Reitman, 1993) found that fathers whose wives worked outside the home earned twenty percent less and were on a slower career track than fathers whose wives stayed home. The study's authors concluded that organizations still reward men who completely devote themselves to their jobs. In one organization I worked with, a group of executives complaining about the extraordinary demands and stresses of their own jobs agreed in the next breath that they evaluated their direct reports partly on the basis of the number of hours those individuals put into their jobs. Level of time and energy devoted to work is treated as a primary indicator of the employee's commitment, capability, and potential; it is frequently an implicit criterion for promotion.

Competitive-control approach. Individuals can let work take over their lives because working is consistent with their fundamental approach to life. It is an approach in which the accomplishments of work are more valuable than the pleasures of personal life, and the rewards of work are more tangible than those of personal life. I refer to this as the competitive-control approach. It includes such behaviors as competing with others to win, focusing on setting and achieving goals, being aggressive and action-oriented, valuing individualism and autonomy, taking an exclusively rational view of people and issues, and feeling most comfortable when "in charge."

People with a competitive-control approach are uncomfortable with what I call the collaborative-connected approach, which includes expressing emotions and revealing vulnerability, asking for help, attending to one's own feelings, accepting one's own and others' weaknesses, being concerned with others' needs and wants, being playful and spontaneous, and seeking to collaborate and share influence. Managerial work in typical hierarchical organizations allows people who take the competitive-control approach to feel and appear competent while at the same time allowing them to avoid the discomfort of intimacy with others and with their own emotions.

Competitive-control behaviors tend to be more valued in hierarchical organizations than they are at home (Lobel, 1993). As a result, mastery-oriented individuals are likely to prefer staying at work. Even when they do try to attend to personal life, they often take the competitive-control approach there, trying to structure it into a series of activities and accomplishments—

for instance, managing their children and competing in sports. This approach often causes problems—such as being resented by significant others who may be more interested in collaboration, intimacy, and play.

Typical hierarchical organizations, for the most part, encourage the competitive-control approach. It is consistent with the set of attitudes and behaviors traditionally seen as comprising effective leadership and management. Effective leaders and managers are expected to do such things as set goals and visions, give orders, and drive change down through the organization. Cultures valuing competitive-control tend not to value (and thus their managers tend not to develop) the collaborative-connected characteristics. Because collaborative-connected attitudes and behaviors are crucial to the formation of close relationships, including those in the family, the organization thus encourages the development of a behavioral style and character structure that may be more functional at the (competitive-control) workplace than it is away from work.

Indeed, the competitive-control style is not entirely functional at work, either. Managerial and leadership effectiveness also involves the use of such abilities as sensitivity to intuitive data (in addition to rational data), attention to process (in addition to outcome), and the ability to empower others. These kinds of skills have been systematically devalued in organizations until recently, and they are the ones most difficult for executives to develop because of the countervailing cultural and personal forces described here.

Self-idealization. Competing and controlling support the self-esteem of mastery-oriented individuals, while collaboration and connectedness threaten it. Competition and control are consistent with the masterful image these individuals believe they must present. In contrast, collaboration and connectedness threaten to reveal sides of them they prefer to keep hidden—vulnerability, self-doubt, and a need for love. In the executives I studied, the association of competition and control with self-esteem was usually rooted in childhood, in which these individuals were often rewarded and disciplined according to a set of prescriptions for the kind of person they “should” be. This internalized set of prescriptions, typically involving mastery and competence, formed an idealized image which they strove to fulfil, an image which many still pursue through adulthood. According to this view, in both childhood and adulthood, the agency granting self-esteem is outside oneself; only by serving the objectives of that person or institution can one feel valued and worthy.

The organization encourages this self-idealization. People adopt organizational expectations for how they should feel and behave because organiza-

tional rewards such as promotion become the conditions for their self-esteem. This becomes especially noticeable when other aspects of life, such as family, have diminished in importance and potential to reward. Typically, in career systems, an employee's growth and development is seen as occurring through upward movement in the organization. Even in today's flatter organizations, where opportunities to move upward have declined and promotion has been largely supplanted by in-job development and lateral movement, many managers continue to hold aspirations to move up—the only difference being that this badge of worth has become rarer (and thus more valuable). Therefore, an employee who wishes to gain esteem for accomplishments at work will find the most reliable source of such esteem from working long hours and getting promoted—regardless of whether higher position and broader scope of hierarchical authority are most consistent with his or her talents, values, or direction of desired development.

Organizations also promote an idealized managerial image through standardized performance expectations and competency models which leave little room for individual differences. These profiles do not encourage individuals to develop and be rewarded for important nonmanagerial skills, or for skills they use in managing which do not fit the profiles. Rather, in order to "succeed" on the organization's terms, they must conform to molds shaped by existing organizational positions, succession plans, and career development systems.

How WFPs Reinforce Mastery Orientation

We can now approach the central thesis of my argument: For WFPs to truly address work-personal life conflict, they would have to confront the mastery orientation and its system of deep forces which lead people to focus on work and which lead organizations to reward that work focus. However, in their current design and implementation approach, WFPs perpetuate the mastery orientation. Because most organizational cultures and most executives operate according to the mastery orientation, champions find themselves advocating WFPs on the basis of mastery-oriented success criteria, and designing and implementing WFPs according to mastery-oriented principles. This quite naturally limits the extent to which WFPs are able to help organizations make the cultural shift away from the mastery orientation. Specifically, I suggest that WFPs support work as the primary life priority, are designed and implemented using a competitive-control approach, and reinforce self-idealization. I will support each of these assertions separately.

WFPs support work as the primary life priority. We have seen that many WFPs are designed to enable employees to focus their energy on work. Personal life is seen either as an intrusion into the employee's productivity (e.g., when the employee has a sick child) or as an aid to productivity (e.g., when the employee uses the fitness center at lunchtime). The content of much supervisor training on work-family issues suggests that the final judgments regarding an employee's taking advantage of a WFP such as personal leave are made on the basis of whether there is any urgent work that would be compromised by the person's absence. Jobs that become candidates for part-time, flextime, or job-shared status are those that are perceived as being less essential to organizational outcomes. For example, senior line management jobs are rarely, if ever, job-shared. Thus, the assumption that WFPs perpetuate is that, if an individual seeks to devote more time and energy to personal life, there will be a cost to the individual's organizational effectiveness and/or career success. The best employees—those who can be trusted to perform the critical tasks and those who reach executive positions—are those who focus their priorities on work.

Furthermore, WFPs primarily apply to those whose work performance is hindered by spillover from personal life issues such as child and elder care, not those whose personal life or well-being is impaired by spillover from work issues such as stress, preoccupation, or overload. My research shows that many executives, although they may not experience visible personal life spillover into work, may experience very real work spillover into personal life—indeed, their personal lives may be headed for crisis. But WFPs do not address these executives' problems. An executive who focuses exclusively on work and has an unhappy personal life, but who is productive by the organization's account, is not considered a person who needs WFPs to help him handle his work-personal life conflict. But a single mother who needs information regarding child care options so that she can choose a situation that does not interfere with her work schedule is considered a person who needs WFPs to help her handle her work-personal life conflict to avoid a potential hindrance to work. The operative criterion is the degree to which personal life spills over into work productivity.

WFPs are designed and implemented using a competitive-control approach. The emphasis on control in the mastery orientation leads people to expect change to occur through a small group of senior managers who control the knowledge, information, and decisions about the desired intervention. Consistent with this expectation, WFPs are typically "sold" to senior management and implemented from the top down. For example, a Conference Board

study found that, in many organizations which successfully implemented WFPs, the human resources department initiated the change, the CEO was seen as decision-maker, and much of middle management remained indifferent or hostile (Martinez, 1993). WFPs are designed by "experts," perhaps with some input from a cross-sectional committee; then this design is approved and modified by senior managers; and finally the program is communicated to the bulk of organization members (Michaels, 1992). At the level of the individual employee, the use of WFPs must be approved and then the impact on the employee's performance closely monitored by the employee's supervisor (Geber, 1993). Thus, the supervisor has final say about, for example, who gets how much time off. Also, WFP implementation usually involves establishing measurements that allow leaders to track program impact on the bottom line (thus reinforcing the view that bottom-line outcomes of such programs can be directly measured, predicted, and controlled).

Another example of WFPs' emphasis on control is that many of the workshops, readings, and tools provided to help employees balance work and personal life emphasize the quick fix, listing tips for achieving instant balance. Such materials suggest that one can impose balance on oneself by taking charge and imposing rules—which is simply another form of the competitive-control approach, this time applied to oneself.

WFPs reinforce self-idealization. In the view being developed here, WFPs perpetuate the notion that the way for one to be worthy is to become the kind of person the organization wants one to be and to move progressively up in the hierarchy. The design of WFPs is predicated on this assumed desire for upward mobility and other signs of success. Consequently, WFPs seek to remove the external circumstances that prevent the employee from being able to focus on organization needs and thus to move into positions of increasing responsibility. This implies that, in the value system underlying WFPs, personal life matters only insofar as it can either enhance or hinder the organization's success. The ideal employee works to serve the organization and never lets his or her personal life interfere with that commitment.

Further enabling personal development to be subordinated to and channeled by organizational outcomes, the ultimate assessment of and justification for WFPs is their impact on the bottom line. Programs are evaluated in terms of their costs and benefits to the organization, rather than their investment in and impact on individuals' actualization and development (except as actualization and development support the bottom line). WFPs seek to create happy employees only because this suggests they can be productive employees.

Because WFPs ignore and even reinforce a primary cause of work-personal life conflict, mastery-oriented forces continue to operate. The practical result is that these forces undermine the objectives of WFPs—both the individual's relief from work-personal life conflict and the organization's gain in productivity. This helps to explain the problems which organizations have encountered in implementing WFPs.

How Mastery Orientation Explains WFP Problems

The difficulties encountered in implementing WFPs—not valued by senior management, stigmatizing users while being avoided by career oriented people, and so on—can be understood as unintended consequences that result when WFPs are grafted onto the still-predominant mastery orientation. In this view, WFPs are overlaid, like band-aids, onto a culture in which organizations continue to reinforce the emphasis on work and the competitive-control approach, and members continue to drive themselves to work hard at the expense of personal life in the quest to feel worthy. Following are several specific ways in which this band-aid effect contributes to the problems with WFPs: Executives' mastery orientation biases them against WFPs; the willingness to focus on work is used to separate executives and high-potentials from others; a competitive-control management approach is too limited to administer WFPs; individual success is defined according to mastery-oriented criteria; WFPs make women's commitment to personal life more salient. Once again, I will offer support for each of these assertions.

Executives' mastery orientation biases them against WFPs. In my experience, most executives are mastery-oriented and are, accordingly, likely to believe that life balance interferes with organizational effectiveness. They see those who devote their time and energy to work and who take a competitive-control approach as the most effective and committed employees, and those who seek balance as less so.

Furthermore, these executives are likely to have a great deal of emotional investment in this position, as it is a guiding principle for their own lives. A recent *Wall Street Journal* survey polled CEOs of the largest one hundred companies (Rubin, 1994). Of the seventy-six who responded, none had ever used child care, and ninety-five percent had wives who had never worked outside the home. We can reasonably conclude that these CEOs believe that in order to be a successful top executive, one must have someone at home taking care of all personal-life responsibilities.

In addition, executives' conscious belief system regarding the primacy of work and the low value of WFPs probably stems in part from their own

deep feelings and conflicts regarding the choices and sacrifices they have made in their careers (Hall & Richter, 1988). The mere presence of WFPs may make personal life more visible in the organization and evoke the issue of making trade-offs between work and personal life, thus threatening the mechanisms many executives have built up to deny and justify their own life imbalance.

Willingness to focus on work is used to separate executives and high-potentials from others. The willingness to place work first, which is reinforced by the mastery orientation, creates two classes of employees in regard to WFPs. In one class, there are those who have no choice about whether they will use WFPs. This class includes lower level and primarily female employees who might be single parents or live in other nontraditional family structures, and who are likely to have limited financial resources. Their use of WFPs stigmatizes them and further decreases their opportunities for successful and fulfilling careers.

The second class includes members of the executive, managerial, and professional populations—particularly males with traditional family supports. Many of these employees are primarily concerned about their career advancement and are reluctant to participate in WFPs (except the “safe” ones, such as wellness and fitness programs). They avoid WFPs and continue to focus on work. The organizational rewards these members derive from their undue focus on work, as well as their disproportional representation in the most powerful positions, reinforce the predominance of mastery-oriented definitions of success.

The competitive-control management approach is too limited to administer WFPs. As I have described it, the competitive-control approach to management does not include the kind of behavioral flexibility and personal involvement that administering WFPs requires. With the competitive-control approach, all subordinates are treated alike because this is believed necessary to ensure legal definitions of equity. A supervisor only needs to deal with the portion of a subordinate that is directly performing the job; other portions of the person that exist outside the job are irrelevant. Personal feelings and compassion for personal needs are inappropriate to the supervisor's relationship with the subordinate. All of these assumptions about the supervisory role must change when the supervisor becomes responsible for administering WFPs, but competitive-control is the only managerial approach many supervisors know. It is also the approach implicitly associated with organizational reinforcement. Thus, supervisors' resistance can be

understood as being rooted in fear and discomfort with the prospect of a fundamentally different way of leading and being with others.

Individual success is defined according to mastery-oriented criteria.

As I have already suggested, organizational reward systems are defined by and for mastery-oriented individuals. Therefore, organizationally dispensed badges of worth (such as promotion) are believed to be more significant than any personal-life-derived source of worth. Because of this circular definition, those who hold work primary and who therefore achieve high position are identified as the admired role models, defined as doing well and being worthy.

In addition, neither individual well-being nor development towards personal goals is considered integral to organizational success. Thus, little effort has been made to integrate WFPs into the real purpose of the organization. Consequently, WFPs are seen as peripheral, isolated from the organization's core of productive work. This isolation is compounded by the fact that these programs are typically initiated and administered by the human resources function. In fact, it is suggested by many experts that a special position be created to champion and manage WFPs, with a title such as work-family coordinator. Although this may draw attention to the issue, it may also further marginalize it.

WFPs make women's commitment to personal life more salient.

Because the focus on work continues to be valued, and because most senior decision-makers are male and live in traditional family structures, WFPs may support a world view in which men should focus on career and women should focus on the family. In doing so, WFPs may be feeding a backlash against career-oriented women. The notion that women are more likely to harbor a productivity-damaging commitment to personal life, a notion made more salient by the presence of WFPs, may help explain why many women view family policies as "lethal" to their advancement, and why some new female MBA graduates are said to remove their wedding rings before job interviews (Sharpe, 1994).

Further implications of the Band-Aid effect. Because WFPs, as they are currently formulated, operate at the symptomatic level and reinforce the deeper forces leading to work-personal life conflict, they will almost certainly not lead to the kind of culture change WFP champions are seeking, one in which employees' personal lives are respected and individuals in diverse family circumstances can succeed and develop. Some WFP champions claim that organizations must pass through incremental phases of transition towards cultural change. But, instead, as WFPs are rolled out piecemeal, they are co-

opted into instruments of mastery-oriented values and work practices. Consequently, it is common to witness scenarios similar to the one I saw in my work with middle- and senior-level managers in a corporation with well-publicized WFPs. In workshops and meetings, these managers regularly work extended hours, beginning their day at 7:00 A.M. and continuing until 10:00 or 11:00 P.M. They rationalize this by describing the culture as "macho" and saying with pride that people in their company have the stamina to do what must be done, even if such long hours are involved. When asked, they see no contradiction between their behavior and the company's espoused desire for a family-friendly workplace. The implicit message is that we who are the leaders and are responsible for the organization must work long hours. Balancing work and family is for other people "down there" who are not truly invested in or essential to organizational success.

Perhaps the most convincing evidence of the effect of the mastery orientation on WFP effectiveness can be seen in the track record of actual WFP interventions. For example, a recent *Wall Street Journal* survey of 38,000 companies found that WFPs have had mixed success in helping more women reach management positions (Sharpe, 1994). In fact, some of the companies with the most extensive WFPs have the worst records for promoting women. The author cited the example of DuPont, which is widely known for its extensive programs, including day care, flextime, and flexplace. DuPont insiders reported that women who use flextime cannot rise to senior management positions. One employee described a mothers' support group she joined along with four other fast-track women, all of whom eventually derailed. She slowed her work pace from eighty to sixty hours per week and, as a result, found herself less visible and overlooked for promotions. The reporter found that some ambitious women at DuPont avoid using WFPs, fearing that doing so relegates them to the "mommy track," that male managers are still not comfortable working with women, that women's more "expressive style" is not seen as acceptable in senior management, and that the company is still characterized by a "hierarchical male dominated corporate culture." In other words, even at a company popularly considered a benchmark for WFPs, these programs have not changed the prevailing mastery-oriented culture of competitive-control leadership behaviors and a primary focus on work.

Such reported difficulties with WFPs are being used as ammunition by the opponents who campaign to abandon them. The flaw in the opposition argument, however, is the enormous and unrecognized cost of mastery orientation to organizational effectiveness, as we will see in the next section.

As currently formulated, the WFP Band-Aid masks the mastery orientation and its negative consequences for individuals and organizations—despite the fact that effectively designed WFPs could potentially play the role of attacking these problems at their source.

Unrecognized Costs of the Mastery Orientation Which WFPs Disguise

A major conclusion of the research I have conducted is that mastery orientation in the workplace is manifested in individual and group behaviors with negative consequences for organizational effectiveness. Specifically, the focus of time and energy on work leads to crisis and burnout; the competitive-control approach to leadership leads to disempowerment, flawed decisions, and unsurfaced dissent; and the idealized image of individual development leads to careerism and optimization of personal agendas. I will support each of these implications and conclusions. (For more detailed descriptions, see Table 2.)

Focus on work leads to crisis and burnout. People who focus their time and energy on work may drive themselves to work at the expense of their own health, well-being, and personal relationships. This has several consequences for their behavior in the workplace. When they experience life crises as a result of overwork (illness, divorce, and so on), their productivity and effectiveness are drastically reduced. At the same time, they are likely to deny and rationalize their focus on work and any detrimental effects on their personal life and well-being. This occurs because such people, who prefer working over other life activities and who work even when it harms their well-being, are addicted to work (Schaeff & Fassel, 1988). Their behavior and conscious attitude about their overwork is like that of any other addict: They justify their overwork and deny its consequences, saying that they work because they enjoy it and that working hard leads to personal and collective benefits.

Meanwhile, this overwork has a grave impact on others in the organization, especially those with less power and status. They often feel compelled to demonstrate a corresponding focus on work, and consequently experience stress, burnout, and the violation of their work-personal life boundaries (for example, when the mastery-oriented individual telephones them at night or on weekends, or demands that work be taken home).

The organization as a whole is likely to show the collective impact of an overdominant focus on work. Symptoms of burnout such as reduced creativity and commitment are likely to appear. Also, the tendency is to become overly focused on short-term task performance and to respond to

Table 2
Unrecognized Costs of Mastery Orientation

Aspect of the mastery orientation	Negative impact on leader's behavior and approach	Negative impact on others	Negative impact on organization-wide outcomes
Maintain imbalance towards work	• Do not attend to health, well-being, relationships	• Feel forced to overwork	• Burnout: physical, intellectual, emotional
Disown unacceptable parts of self	• Suppress own doubts • Disregard relevant feelings, intuition • Disregard data about physical, emotional problems	• Censor questions, doubts • Censor own feelings, intuition • Edit or withhold negative data	• Burnout • Lose important decision data, criteria • Small problems grow unchecked
Polarize others	• "Halo" and "horns" categorization • Underutilize talents they don't know how to value	• Censor feelings and behavior viewed as unacceptable • Overidentify with leader's desires • Feel misunderstood or mistreated • Create like-leader/not-like-leader subgroups	• Loss of diverse knowledge and skills • Homogeneity of viewpoint and skills • Loss of commitment and energy • Increased risk of discrimination
Use instrumental approach towards others	• Lack empathy and compassion • Utilize any means to an end	• Feel objectified, manipulated • Don't commit discretionary energy	• Reductions in force that are destructive and create survivor syndrome • Poor development of talent, lack of depth in replacements

Use aggressive energy	• Polarized behavior: bottled up emotions and angry outbursts • Unable, unwilling to tap own emotional data • Lead by anger and fear	• Fear, resentment • Withhold emotions • Intimidated, withhold negative information • Avoid confrontation	• Problems withheld because of "shoot messenger" syndrome • Difficulty getting consensus about highly political issues • Low-level emotions (like anxiety) lost as sources of insight
Impose standards on others	• Perfectionist • Demanding	• Stress, resentment • No opportunity to generate own standards	• No internalized accountability for decisions and actions
Push for results and closure	• Focus on short-term outcomes • Impatient with process • Lack process skills • Avoid considering risks and options • Devalue others' input	• Pressured for decisions • Feel underutilized • Censor opinions and ideas • Withhold vital decision-making information	• Neglect of long-term consequences • Inability to diagnose process-based problems • Key information not factored into decisions • Costly recycling through decision-making process • Inflexible plans
Maintain interpersonal distance	• Don't express doubts • Aloof, distant, superficially personable • Don't ask for or accept help • Assume demeanor of self-sufficiency, arrogance	• Don't feel need or opportunity to provide help, ideas, support • Are mistrustful	• Overconfident decisions don't consider risks • Decisions don't utilize all information
Emphasize rationality, seriousness	• Don't use intuitive or emotional data in making decisions • Don't form comfortable working relationships • Don't express praise, appreciation to others • Don't play with ideas or encourage creative slack • Don't consider human impact of decisions	• Forced to censor own emotions, intuition • Uncomfortable with leader • Feel undervalued, unappreciated • Lose opportunity for creative banter • Demoralized • Resist, disagree with decisions	• Decisions miss nonrational data • No internalized accountability for decisions and actions • Implementation delays and difficulties due to reluctance, resistance, malicious compliance, sabotage

Table 2 (cont.)

Aspect of the mastery orientation	Negative impact on leader's behavior and approach	Negative impact on others	Negative impact on organization-wide outcomes
Strive to be autonomous, in charge	• Won't admit mistakes, accept input • Can't acknowledge risks of own behavior or alternatives • Won't delegate substantive matters • Unwilling to share authority • Micro-manage • Anxious when not controlling	• Not heard, utilized • Withhold ideas and motivation • Disempowered • Intimidated	• Dissenting ideas not incorporated into decisions • Ideas not generated by those who know work best • Decisions, information, and power concentrated in leader • Few checks on bad decisions • Learned helplessness
Emphasis on competing, winning	• Want to beat others, put need to win above other goals • Don't relinquish good staffers for their own career progress • Don't give others credit • Don't cooperate with peers	• Don't cooperate with leader • Feel forced to take sides • Demotivated • Miss developmental opportunities • Competitive response to leader • Resent leader's credit-stealing	• Broader organizational objectives are sub-optimized • No alignment around shared goals • Counterproductive focus on competition • Collaborative opportunities missed
Identification with organization goals	• Adopt organizational values, personal values undeveloped • Base ethical judgments on career benefits • Fail to challenge organizational objectives and methods	• Mistrust • Expect self-serving decisions	• Ethical problems in decision making • Organizational follies go undetected
Identification with superiors' whims, upward orientation	• Seek to please superiors at expense of others' needs	• Experience leader as disloyal and unsupportive	• Decreased performance, commitment among career "losers" and staffers

business pressure by working harder and longer rather than smarter. This short-term focus usually leads organization members to neglect strategic perspectives and issues. And, as with individuals, organizations can be addicts. Thus, they will hold productivity as the primary cause of success and strive for ever-increasing productivity even if effectiveness by other criteria (such as value creation) is being compromised. Furthermore, the organization is likely to deny the problems caused by overwork because driving members to higher productivity to the point of burnout can yield some short-term benefits.

Competitive-control approach to leadership leads to disempowerment, flawed decisions, and unsurfaced dissent. In mastery-oriented organizations, the valued approach to leadership can be characterized as suppressing the unmasterful sides of self, judging co-workers according to their competence, taking an instrumental approach to people, using aggressive energy, imposing high standards on others, pushing for results, maintaining interpersonal distance, emphasizing rationality and seriousness, and striving to be autonomous and "in charge." In mastery-oriented organizations, leaders are expected to be the most knowledgeable and powerful members of their groups, and they will tend to hoard information and dominate decision making; be demanding and perfectionistic; focus on speedy implementation and short-term outcomes; be impatient with group planning and decision processes; tend not to express positive emotions such as praise or appreciation to co-workers; be reluctant to ask for help, accept input, or admit mistakes; make decisions that ignore intuitive or emotional data, minimize risks and options, and miss key information held by others. Correspondingly, in such organizations others may feel demoralized, disempowered, underutilized; they may withhold key information or ideas; they may resist decisions made without their input; they may act submissive or helpless. And the organization as a whole may become plagued by decisions that do not utilize all the available information, inflexible strategies, short-term solutions, widespread resistance and unsurfaced dissent regarding courses of action, disempowerment and learned helplessness, and inability to effectively utilize conflict.

Self-idealization leads to careerism and optimizing personal agendas. My research also indicates that mastery-oriented leaders are likely to channel their personal development in ways that optimize career outcomes and that get them top management's esteem. They are likely to focus their attention on competing to "win" and optimizing their own results according to organizational measures; they are likely to identify with the organization, believing that, as one executive said, "I *am* the organization," and thus that

what is good for them must be good for the organization; they are likely to focus their attention upward, on the expectations and evaluations of their superiors. Such leaders may manifest these attitudes in specific behaviors such as seeking to "beat" others, and they may put their desire to win over broader organizational considerations, which may play out in optimizing their own unit's objectives rather than broader organizational objectives. They also may hoard high-performing subordinates, discouraging them from moving to other positions which would benefit the subordinates' development or the organization's effectiveness. They may take credit for their subordinates' accomplishments. They may fail to cooperate with their peers. They may base decisions with ethical components on the potential implications for their own careers. They may seek to make themselves look good in their superiors' eyes at the expense of other outcomes. The impact of such behaviors on others is likely to include cynicism, mistrust, unwillingness to cooperate, and resentment regarding the leader's disloyalty and lack of support. The organization as a whole is likely to pay a price, too. Managers who each optimize their own personal and unit objectives will not be likely to align as a group around shared organizational goals. The organization may be characterized by counterproductive intergroup competition. Unethical decisions may be made. Subordinates may show decreased commitment and performance.

This portrayal of the mastery orientation may seem negative, and some managers have reacted by arguing that the mastery orientation has been effective. Indeed, the mastery orientation has come to dominate organizational life because of its advantages. For example, decisions can be made efficiently, work roles are simplified, open conflict is minimal, and rewards for executives and managers are substantial. However, as organizations seek to adapt to increasingly turbulent environments, to move towards high-involvement states in which all members are fully utilized, and to become more responsible to their communities and environments, the costs of the mastery orientation may begin to outweigh the benefits.

It is difficult for many to imagine an alternative to the mastery orientation. Yet such an alternative is exactly what is needed if we are to create organizational cultures that support work-personal life balance and that provide a context in which WFPs can be effective.

Creating Organizations Which Support Life Balance

I assume that if you have read this far you are at least staying open to the argument I have advanced with respect to the inimical relationship between the typical mastery orientation in organizations and life balance, and the resulting impact on WFPs. This argument makes it possible to conceive of concrete ways to change what I see as the predominantly ineffective culture of many organizations. If WFPs are to succeed in creating a culture that values life balance and that optimizes productivity/effectiveness, it will be necessary to change the organizational context within which they operate. Furthermore, it will not be enough to merely modify a mastery-oriented organization to make it amenable to WFPs, because mastery orientation conflicts inherently with a value on life balance. I am suggesting that the only way to create an environment for life balance and for effective WFPs is to engage organization members in directly confronting and changing the mastery orientation. It will be necessary to revisit assumptions regarding how organizations can best accomplish their objectives, how individuals can best contribute to organizations, and what role organizations should play in individuals' whole lives.

It will also be necessary to revisit the goal of WFPs. Instead of seeking to reduce visible work-personal life conflicts which hamper productivity, WFPs will ultimately better enable productivity if they pursue the goal of enhancing life balance. Life balance must be seen as an integral component of fulfilling the organization's purpose, and WFPs as we currently know them must be only one aspect of a culture supporting balance.

Making this fundamental change will not be for everyone. Doing so requires both policy-makers and champions to be not only concerned with improving organizational outcomes, but also committed to the value of individual actualization through work. It will also require that these members be willing to recognize their own attitudes and values which conflict with balance, and willing to change their own behavior to better support balance. Various aspects of the change process I will propose have already been implemented in various settings, and results suggest that making these changes can not only alleviate work-personal life conflict, but also improve organizational outcomes such as leveraging diversity and fully utilizing members' talent and energy.

Key Elements of a Culture Supporting Life Balance

To support balance and allow WFPs to be effective, an organization's culture must support each of the three aspects of work-personal life balance: time-and-energy distribution across life areas, collaborative-connected leadership, and self-realization.

Time-and-energy distribution across life areas. The organization must value individuals who are committed to experience outside the workplace, recognizing that other life dimensions and sides of self contribute to the value the individual brings to work and that people who live a rounded life are likely to be more adaptive and less likely to burn out in facing the constant turbulence of contemporary organizational life. Individuals who are living rich lives outside work are likely to bring in skills and ideas that add to organizational capabilities—such as networks from community involvement, managerial skills from parenting, teamwork ideas from organized sports, and stress-management capability from spiritual practice.

Supporting time-and-energy balance will also require new ways of defining an individual's expected contribution, such as a clear shared purpose and a clear statement of how the individual adds value in the pursuit of this purpose. These definitions provide individuals with an ongoing standard against which to choose activities and behaviors that add value (Dover, 1993). Thus, number of hours spent at work becomes irrelevant as an indicator of capability, contribution, or commitment.

Collaborative-connected leadership. The organization must value a collaborative-connected leadership approach. This approach is characterized by collaborative establishment of performance expectations and standards; consensus decision-making process; utilization of rational, emotional, and intuitive data; emotional competence; preference for sharing power; and caring and respect for others. This approach to self and world is more functional when the individual turns to personal life, and more supportive of other members' life balance. It is also more productive in today's workplace, as it more fully utilizes the range of capabilities in the organization, leads to more widespread commitment and ownership, and is more sensitive to changes in the environment.

Self-realization. The organization must value the personal development of its members just as much as it values achieving organizational outcomes. Thus, the organization must provide opportunities to identify the personal goals and talents of each member, and to integrate those goals and utilize those talents in pursuit of the common purpose.

Interventions Towards a Balance-Supportive Culture

In order to effectively create a culture supporting balance, the transition process must proceed according to guidelines consistent with balance. Change agents must lead with their own behavior. In addition to recognizing and changing their own mastery-oriented behaviors, they can help create a climate for balance by initiating dialogues about the issue and supporting others seeking to balance their lives. Second, the transition to a new culture must occur collaboratively, with widespread involvement and consensus on the vision and associated interventions. Third, it will be necessary to think systemically. Change towards balance will require looking at the organization as a whole and all its component systems, structures, and practices, to ensure that they support balance.

The following series of interventions based on the theory presented in the first half of this paper is designed to help change agents ensure widespread commitment to the balanced culture, and to produce a comprehensive design tailored to the organization's specific situation. The interventions include: assessing the level of mastery orientation and the organizational and individual costs; demonstrating to members the costs of mastery orientation; clarifying organization purpose and vision for balance; providing individual coaching for mastery-oriented executives; determining areas of misalignment with balance and implementing aligned balance-oriented practices; and implementing WFPs as needed. Each intervention builds upon the preceding ones and sets the stage for the subsequent ones.

Assessing the level of mastery orientation and the organizational and individual costs. The intent here is to understand the extent to which current psychological styles of individuals and culture patterns of the organization reflect the mastery orientation. These styles and patterns will need to be confronted, taken into account, and even utilized during subsequent interventions. Assessment involves looking at individual behaviors and organizational expectations about members' time-and-energy allocation, valued approach to leadership, and goal of personal development (self-idealization or self-realization). Appendix B contains a set of assessment instruments which are intended to assist in the diagnosis of each of the above issues.

An effective way to conduct the assessments of individual mastery-oriented behaviors and attitudes is for all members to self-assess. Assessment 1 focuses on individual beliefs and behavior about time-and-energy distribution. Assessment 2 focuses on individual beliefs and behavior about effective

leadership. Assessment 3 focuses on individual beliefs and behavior about the goal of personal development.

It is useful for the senior management team to conduct a group assessment, its members sharing and discussing their own approaches to balance and leadership. This group assessment would enable them to identify their collective degree of mastery orientation and their collective leadership approach and to discuss the probable impact of their collective style on the organization.

It is also important to assess the organizational culture for balance. Assessment 4 focuses on cultural values and practices regarding time-and-energy distribution. Assessment 5 focuses on cultural values and practices regarding the valued leadership approach. Assessment 6 focuses on cultural values and practices regarding the goal of personal development. These organizational-level assessments might be conducted by a liaison group whose members represent a range of organizational stakeholders and who each collect data from the group they represent.

After assessing the level of mastery orientation, it is important to help organization members see mastery orientation's negative consequences to their well-being and their organization's effectiveness. Assessment 7 addresses organizational costs of mastery orientation. Again, this might well be conducted by a liaison group representing all stakeholders. Liaison group members could collect data from their own stakeholder groups, so that the final assessment of costs incorporates all views.

Demonstrating to members the costs of mastery orientation. In this phase, those members who conducted the assessment of mastery orientation's costs disseminate the results of the assessment throughout the organization. A widespread awareness of how the mastery orientation is manifested and how it is harming individual well-being and organizational effectiveness can be an important factor in sharpening the perceived need for change. Such awareness can also facilitate specific interventions. For example, training and development activities may be designed to help individuals learn balanced interpersonal behaviors; members are more likely to commit to such training if they are aware of the negative consequences of their mastery-oriented behaviors.

Clarifying purpose and vision for balance. The first goal here is to develop a clear statement of organizational purpose, using processes which ensure consensus among all members. This shared purpose can become the basis for individuals' choices regarding membership in the organization and their specific role and contribution. Such a purpose statement allows members to identify the individual skills and knowledge that are valued and supported,

to define their role so they can best use their own talents and goals to optimally contribute to the organizational purpose, and to redesign their work so that it most efficiently provides that contribution and minimizes inessential tasks.

The second goal is to develop a shared vision of how life balance relates to the organization's effective pursuit of its purpose, again in a way that ensures consensus. This vision of balance clearly defines the desired culture in terms of time-and-energy distribution, leadership approach, and self-realization. This provides a standard for subsequent programmatic efforts and design activities.

Providing individual coaching for mastery-oriented executives.

Many executives are likely to be uncomfortable with balanced values and behavior, and to resist WFPs and other balance-related initiatives. This resistance can hinder any organizational interventions towards balance. Thus, executives must from the start of this change process confront the mastery orientation in themselves. They must also confront the price they have paid personally and the cost the organization as a whole is incurring. Without recognition of this price, there can be no motivation for personal change. And without personal change, these executives may always devalue, resist, and unconsciously sabotage balance. Executives who recognize and confront their own mastery orientation will be more likely to move towards balance in their own lives, support balance in others, and champion organizational practices encouraging balance. Executive coaching involves providing executives with feedback from co-workers and significant others regarding their behavior and its impact on others, helping executives to understand the roots of these behaviors in their character and life history, and working with executives to reshape new, more balanced behaviors (see Kaplan, Drath, & Kofodimos, 1991).

Determining areas of misalignment with balance and implementing aligned balance-oriented practices. It is necessary to examine several areas of organizational practice to diagnose their status with respect to balance. With this information, redesign activities can target the specific practices that are out of alignment with the desired culture. Often, organizations implement new policies and practices without eliminating the old ones. This can set up conflicting messages, unintentionally reinforce the status quo, and confuse people. To avoid these problems, it is important to stop mastery-oriented practices currently in existence.

In Appendix C I have provided examples of specific interventions in each of the following practice areas as a catalyst to others' thinking. The

areas of practice that most need to be considered are: work design and staffing; measurement, compensation, and incentives; performance management; training and development; and career development.

Work design will support balance if it is done collaboratively and if the resulting designs allow individuals the opportunity to optimize existing talents and strengths and to develop in desired areas. Tasks and roles can be designed in ways that consider life balance as well as task performance; for example, length of work shifts. Cross-training can make it easier for the work to be covered when co-workers take sabbaticals or parental leaves. The process of work design provides an opportunity to surface and revise mastery-oriented assumptions regarding how work should be designed and staffed—for example, the authoritarian, top-down assumption that jobs should be designed by managers or outside experts and merely handed to job occupants for execution. Work design can also incorporate provisions for continual redesign to eliminate low-value activities that demand added time.

The staffing process can support balance by taking a self-selection approach wherein individuals consider skill and interest in selecting desired jobs and assignments. It is also important to utilize alternative models that support balance, such as job sharing, part-time work, flextime, and so on. Finally, staffing reductions will be more consistent with balance if they are managed collaboratively, with the participation of all organization members, including those who might be directly affected.

To support balance, it is useful to focus measurement on behaviors and outcomes that contribute to the organization's creation of value as defined in the purpose. For example, it is possible to determine the behaviors that support value creation and to measure those, rather than measuring factors not necessarily related to value creation such as number of hours spent at work. Furthermore, measures can be developed collaboratively among organizational members, and perhaps with the input of other stakeholders such as customers. These measures can better shape subsequent desired behavior if they focus on improving systems rather than on policing performance.

Compensation and rewards are more likely to support balance if they are based on value creation. This means assessing the extent to which the individual has acquired critical knowledge or skills or the extent to which the individual's output has created value for the organization as a whole, rather than basing compensation on hierarchical level or seniority. Compensation and incentives can be flexible and allow individuals to choose the rewards that are most valuable for them; the menu of rewards can include family-friendly options such as child care assistance. Rewards also provide an

opportunity to encourage balanced behavior. For example, incentives can be provided for nonwork behavior which adds value for the organization, such as education, community service, or sabbaticals which help the individual develop new skills or knowledge. As suggested earlier, it is important to identify and stop rewarding mastery-oriented behaviors such as overworking, competing among departments, making decisions without involving those affected, and so on.

Performance management systems are more consistent with balance if they are self-directed and utilize criteria negotiated among interdependent members of the organization. Assessment can focus on the extent to which the individual has created value and honored key commitments to other members or stakeholders, rather than on behaviors unrelated to value creation. Reinforcement is more effective when it is self-directed and not only provides incentives for desired performance but also feedback regarding current performance. Boundaries and performance issues can be managed collectively among members. Appraisals will support balance if they are self-directed and collaborative, and if they include issues related to the individual's time-and-energy balance, collaborative-connected behaviors, and self-realization.

It will be helpful to provide support for individual training and development that involves identifying personal values, goals, skills, and interests, so that these data can be used to inform the individual's input into work design, placement, career planning, and other such decisions. Such training can also support development and utilization of the whole person. Members' nonwork activities, such as volunteer work or sports, can be considered for their developmental value; conversely, when designing developmental opportunities for individuals, nonwork options can be considered. To support balance, it is useful for development needs and methods to be defined collaboratively. Leadership training which incorporates collaborative-connected behaviors can contribute to a balance-supportive culture. Training opportunities can also be provided to help individuals develop strategies for balancing their lives, to help managers develop skills for supporting life balance, and to help supervisors develop flexible styles for administering WFPs.

Career development activities which are collaborative and self-directed within system constraints will encourage self-realization. So will career planning which is integrated with total life planning, so that work and nonwork elements are incorporated. It is important that career plans and job change decisions involve and assist other family members. Career paths which offer alternatives and flexibility, focusing not on hierarchy but on

contribution, will help to support balance. Career plans can provide opportunities for individuals to take temporary leave without penalty. Career development systems can emphasize work experiences tailored to individual goals and preferences. It is also important to identify how individual career plans and values contribute to the shared purpose.

Implementing supplemental WFPs as needed. At this point, it will be possible to augment what has been done with programs such as child care, parental leave, wellness, and fitness. Choice of programs should be based on assessment of the situation and needs of all members.

Barriers to Balance

Creating a balance-friendly culture is not without difficulties. Potential barriers include: resistance from mastery-oriented executives, the assumption that life balance and organizational effectiveness are incompatible, authoritarian assumptions regarding organization functioning, and pressure from prevailing culture.

Resistance from mastery-oriented executives. Many executives have received substantial externally-conferred rewards for, and have staked their self-esteem on, operating in a mastery-oriented way. For them, the prospect of change involves the likelihood of giving up the behaviors that have led to tangible rewards and perceived security. This orientation hinders the willingness to change, especially because of the pervasive need to appear masterful and to avoid making mistakes or looking incompetent. Executives afraid of losing effectiveness or rewards may claim that balance does not benefit the organization when in fact it merely does not benefit them as individuals. The only way to transcend this resistance is to help executives recognize that the personal and organizational costs of mastery exceed the pain of change to balance, and that the benefits of balance can exceed the benefits of mastery.

The assumption that life balance and organizational effectiveness are incompatible. Mastery-oriented managers frequently express the concern that employees' balancing their lives will get in the way of their productivity, and thus that a balanced culture will never get anything done. These managers assume that creating balance simply entails allowing all employees to reduce the time and energy they devote to work. They fail to recognize the benefits that can result when employees live fulfilling and rounded lives. Furthermore, a truly balanced culture as I have described it will gain effectiveness by incorporating a more productive leadership approach and by more fully leveraging the goals and talents of its members.

Authoritarian assumptions regarding organization functioning.

Many of the changes suggested here involve rethinking how decisions get made, work gets designed, and value is created in the organization. The interventions I have suggested for creating balance utilize the capabilities and aspirations of all organization members by seeking the input and involvement of all these members in the changes being made. This goes against traditional models of hierarchy, which assume the subordination of individual capabilities and needs to organizational plans and structures in which individuals are interchangeable parts, and which also assume that senior management does the thinking and everyone else does the executing.

Pressure from prevailing culture. The balanced organization will be countercultural. The web of interconnected institutions and organizations that surround it are likely to initially continue operating according to the mastery orientation. Thus, balanced organizations must manage their boundaries so environmental expectations and pressures do not push them back into old ways. For example, such organizations can work with their suppliers, customers, and venture partners to encourage the development of balanced cultures, so that all organizations interacting along the value chain operate according to congruent principles. Similarly, it will be easier to create balance in start-up organizations than to transform existing organizations, because the start-up organization can select people, design work processes, and so on, congruent with balance from the beginning.

Conclusion

Despite the obstacles to creating cultures that support balance, tremendous benefits can ensue to the organization and to its individual members. Organizational benefits include increased value creation, heightened creativity, more commitment from members, better decision making, and more efficient resource utilization. Individual benefits include a feeling of increased connection with the organization, enhanced personal life satisfaction, more fulfillment from work, and, of course, reduced work-family conflict.

WFPs play a key role in the balanced organization. Opportunities such as flexible work structures and child care benefits are needed supports for individuals seeking to integrate work and personal life and will continue to be important within a balance-supportive culture. The difference will lie in the success of WFPs' implementation: For example, a wider range of individuals will use these programs, and they will not be stigmatized for doing so.

Beyond its role in supporting WFPs, balance-supportive culture has broader significance as a potential context for other interventions towards improved organizational effectiveness. Balanced organizations are congruent with many currently popular workplace trends, such as empowerment, team-based work, and continuous process improvement. Any intervention can benefit from positioning within this culture, if the intervention is one that advocates development and participation of members as an element in achieving improved organizational outcomes.

Despite the potential benefits, balanced cultures face an uphill climb in taking hold in our mastery-oriented culture. Organizational members may resist a new way of operating collectively that requires major shifts in behavior and values; they may remain attached to an accustomed mastery-oriented way of operating that will continue to characterize other institutions in their environment.

However, without a context such as the balance-supportive culture, WFPs are unlikely to accomplish their objectives. The espoused intent of WFPs—the desire to support individuals' personal lives and life balance—is a positive one, and one which has gained the commitment of many advocates and organization members. The content of WFPs—providing logistical support for individuals managing the work-personal life boundary—has been helpful to many users. Yet, without a context that truly values life balance, these positives will be continually undermined by the inherent imbalance of mastery orientation.

The problems in WFPs' typical design and implementation exemplify the problem inherent in many fundamental change efforts. The very forces which cause the underlying problem and the apparent symptoms also limit the effort to create change. There is a lesson here for all who wish to facilitate organizational transformation. As long as change agents continue to collude with prevailing culture in this way, we will not create significant or lasting change. To create fundamental change, we must step out of the mastery-oriented way of thinking and acting—though doing so may require us to confront discomfort and resistance from those who are invested in keeping things as they are.

References

- Austin, N. (1994, July). How managers manage flexibility. *Working Woman*, pp. 19-20.
- Braus, P. (1992, August). What workers want. *American Demographics*, 14(8), 30-37.
- Christensen, K. (1990, July/August). Here we go into the "high-flex" era. *Across the Board*, 27(7,8), 22-23.
- Collins, R., & Magid, R. Y. (1989, January). Taking the myths out of childcare planning. *Management Review*, 78(1), 18-22.
- Cordtz, D. (1990, September 18). Hire me, hire my family. *Financial World*, pp. 76-79.
- Covin, T. J., & Brush, C. C. (1993). A comparison of student and human resource professional attitudes toward work and family issues. *Group and Organization Management*, 18(1), 29-49.
- Cramer, K., & Pearce, J. (1990, November). Work and family policies become productivity tools. *Management Review*, 79(11), 42-44.
- Deutschman, A. (1991, May 20). Pioneers of the new balance. *Fortune*, pp. 60-68.
- Dover, K. R. (1993). *Creating a context for empowerment*. (Available from The Renaissance Group, 1307 Bivins Street, Durham, NC 27707)
- Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., Lee, C., & Mills, S. (1992). An examination of organizational and individual outcomes. *Optimum*, 23(2), 46-59.
- Eichman, C. (1992). Surveys reveal needs for work/family benefits—by both employees and employers. *Employment Relations Today*, 19(4), 389-395.
- Estess, P. S. (1993, February). Make your company family-friendly. *Office Systems*, 10(2), 30-34.
- Falkenberg, L. E., Monachello, M. L., & Edlund, L. C. (1991). What is needed to help women balance work and family responsibilities? *Equal Opportunities International*, 10(3,4), 33-37.
- Flexible work schedules. (1990, June). *Supervision*, 51(6), 3-4.
- Galen, M. (1993a, June 28). Work and family: Companies are starting to respond to workers' needs—and gain from it. *Business Week*, pp. 80-88.
- Galen, M. (1993b, August 9). Sure, 'unpaid leave' sounds simple, but . . . *Business Week*, pp. 32-33.
- Geber, B. (1993, February). The bendable, flexible, open-minded manager. *Training*, 30(2), 46-52.
- Gibbs, N. R. (1993, June 28). Bringing up father. *Time*, pp. 53-61.
- Gilbert, E. (1990, October 15). Employers who help working moms. *National Underwriter*, 94(42), 45-49.
- Gonyea, J. G., & Googins, B. K. (1992, Fall). Linking the worlds of work and family: Beyond the productivity trap. *Human Resource Management*, 31(3), 209-226.
- Goodstein, J. D. (1994). Institutional pressures and strategic responsiveness: Employer involvement in work-family issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(2), 350-382.
- Hall, D. T. (1990). Promoting work/family balance: An organization-change approach. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 4-18.
- Hall, D. T., & Richter, J. (1988). Balancing work life and home life: What can organizations do to help? *Academy of Management Executive*, 2(3), 213-223.
- Kaplan, R. E., Drath, W. H., & Kofodimos, J. R. (1991). *Beyond ambition: How driven managers can lead better and live better*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Klein, E. (1991, November/December). Is your company "family-friendly"? *D&B Reports*, 39(6), 34-37.

- Kofodimos, J. R. (1986). *Paul Simmons, executive: A psychological biography*. Doctoral dissertation, Yale University.
- Kofodimos, J. R. (1993). *Balancing act: How managers can integrate successful careers and fulfilling personal lives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lee, C. (1991, September). Balancing work and family. *Training*, 28(9), 23-28.
- Lobel, S. A. (1993). A value-laden approach to integrating work and family life. *Human Resource Management*, 31(3), 249-265.
- Martinez, M. N. (1993, January). Family support makes business sense. *HR Magazine*, pp. 38-43.
- Matthes, K. (1992, February). Companies can make it their business to care. *HR Focus*, 69(2), 4-5.
- Michaels, B. (1992, January). Work and family pitfalls. *Executive Excellence*, 9(1), 19.
- Otto, K. L. (1992). Integrated leadership: Tenneco breaks the barriers. *Human Resources Professional*, 4(2), 51-54.
- Phillips, K. F., & Bramson, R. M. (1990). Packaging work/family benefits to create maximum impact. *Compensation and Benefits Management*, 7(1), 86-87.
- Rubin, B. M. (1994, April 17). The daddy track. *Raleigh News and Observer*, Section A, pp. 17-19.
- Schachner, M. (1991, November 25). Work/family benefits grow slowly. *Business Insurance*, 25(47), 3, 12-15.
- Schaefer, A. W., & Fassel, D. (1988). *The addictive organization*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Schneer, J. A., & Reitman, F. (1993). Effects of alternate family structures on managerial career paths. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 830-843.
- Schwartz, D. B. (1994). *An examination of the impact of family-friendly policies on the glass ceiling*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Shalowitz, D. (1992, April 27). Benefits administration. *Business Insurance*, 26(17), 3-6.
- Shalowitz, D. (1993, February 1). Employers reap benefits of child care. *Business Insurance*, 27(5), 1, 21.
- Sharpe, R. (1994, March 29). The waiting game: Women make strides, but men stay firmly in top company jobs. *Wall Street Journal*, Section A, pp. 1, 10; Section B, pp. 1, 5.
- Shelley, S. (1992, April). Balancing work and family. *Chemical Engineering*, 99(4), pp. 147-158.
- Tarrant, S. M. (1992, January/February). How companies can become more family friendly. *Journal of Compensation and Benefits*, 7(4), 18-21.
- Verespej, M. A. (1992, June 15). Face time's importance fading away. *Industry Week*, pp. 12-18.
- Woodruff, J. (1990, July/August). What do employees really want? *Across the Board*, 27(7,8), 14-21.
- Woolsey, C. (1992, September 14). Continued growth seen in work-family benefits. *Business Insurance*, 26(37), pp. 13, 16.
- Workplace flexibility: A strategy for doing business*. (1993). Boston: Work/Family Directions.

Appendix A: Work-Family Program Database

- Austin, N. (1994, July). How managers manage flexibility. *Working Woman*, pp. 19-20.
- Berns, P., & Berns, J. (1992, September). Good for business: Corporations adopt the family. *Management Review*, 81(9), 34-38.
- Bernstein, A. (1991, November 25). Corporate America is still no place for kids. *Business Week*, pp. 234-238.
- Braus, P. (1992, August). What workers want. *American Demographics*, 14(8), 30-37.
- Brislin, J. A. (1992, December). Resolving employee benefit administration with family-friendly work policies. *Employee Benefits Journal*, 17(4), 5-10.
- Buglass, K. (1989, September). The business of eldercare. *American Demographics*, 11(9), 32-39.
- Cabrera, J., & Dusky, L. (1990, February). Women executives make some gains: What do women want? *Executive Excellence*, 7(2), 6-8.
- Chen, C. W. (1990, July). Becoming a "preferred employer" for the 1990's. *Personnel*, 67(7), 48.
- Christensen, K. (1990, July/August). Here we go into the "high-flex" era. *Across the Board*, 27(7,8), 22-23.
- Christine, B. (1992, November). Grappling with family leave legislation. *Risk Management*, 39(11), 79-80.
- Clay, J. M. (1989, September). The child care issue: Benefits required by a changing workforce. *Employee Benefits Journal*, 14(3), 32-34.
- Collins, R., & Magid, R. Y. (1989, January). Taking the myths out of childcare planning. *Management Review*, 78(1), 18-22.
- Collins, R., & Magid, R. Y. (1990, July). Work and family: How managers can make a difference. *Personnel*, 67(7), 14-19.
- Connors, N. (1989, November). Elder care: A low-cost, high-return way to help employees. *CFO: The magazine for chief financial officers*, 5(11), 62, 64.
- Cordtz, D. (1990, September 18). Hire me, hire my family. *Financial World*, pp. 76-79.
- Covin, T. J., & Brush, C. C. (1993). A comparison of student and human resource professional attitudes toward work and family issues. *Group and Organization Management*, 18(1), 29-49.
- Cramer, K., & Pearce, J. (1990, November). Work and family policies become productivity tools. *Management Review*, 79(11), 42-44.
- Deutschman, A. (1991, May 20). Pioneers of the new balance. *Fortune*, pp. 60-68.
- Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., Lee, C., & Mills, S. (1992). An examination of organizational and individual outcomes. *Optimum*, 23(2), 46-59.
- Eichman, C. (1992). Surveys reveal needs for work/family benefits—by both employees and employers. *Employment Relations Today*, 19(4), 389-395.
- Estess, P. S. (1993, February). Make your company family-friendly. *Office Systems*, 10(2), 30-34.
- Eubanks, P. (1992, January 20). Family-friendly: Hospitals begin to modernize their time-off policies. *Hospitals*, 66(2), 58, 60.
- Falkenberg, L. E., Monachello, M. L., & Edlund, L. C. What is needed to help women balance work and family responsibilities? *Equal Opportunities International*, 10(3,4), 33-37.
- Flexible work schedules. (1990, June). *Supervision*, 51(6), 3-4.
- Friedman, D. E. (1990). Work and family: The new strategic plan. *Human Resource Planning*, 13(2), 79-89.

- Galen, M. (1993a, June 28). Work and family: Companies are starting to respond to workers' needs—and gain from it. *Business Week*, pp. 80-88.
- Galen, M. (1993b, August 9). Sure, 'unpaid leave' sounds simple, but . . . *Business Week*, pp. 32-33.
- Geber, B. (1993, February). The bendable, flexible, open-minded manager. *Training*, 30(2), 46-52.
- Gibbs, N. R. (1993, June 28). Bringing up father. *Time*, pp. 53-61.
- Gilbert, E. (1990, October 15). Employers who help working moms. *National Underwriter*, 94(42), 45-49.
- Gilbert, E. (1991, March 18). AT&T funds case programs for kids, elders. *National Underwriter*, 95(11), 4, 16.
- Gilbert, E. (1991, December 23). Aetna dubbed a "family-friendly" company. *National Underwriter*, 95(51), pp. 9, 18.
- Glickman, L. L., Birchander, E. L., & Greenberg, J. N. (1989, Spring). Helping companies solve elder-care problems. *Compensation & Benefits Management*, 5(3), 197-201.
- Goff, S. J., Mount, M. K., & Jamison, R. L. (1990). Employer supported child care, work/family conflict, and absenteeism: A field study. *Personnel Psychology*, 43(4), 793-809.
- Gonyea, J. G., & Googins, B. K. (1992, Fall). Linking the worlds of work and family: Beyond the productivity trap. *Human Resource Management*, 31(3), 209-226.
- Gordon, S. (1993, January). Helping corporations care. *Working Woman*, 18(1), 30-32.
- Gummer, B. (1991). The management careers of men and women: Mommy tracks, daddy tracks, and "new age" leadership. *Administration in Social Work*, 15(4), 111-128.
- Half of employers offer spending accounts, most large firms have family-friendly benefits. (1991, December). *Employee Benefit Plan Review*, 46(6), 48-50.
- Hall, D. T. (1989, December). Moving beyond the "mommy track": An organization change approach. *Personnel*, 66(12), 23-29.
- Hall, D. T. (1990). Promoting work/family balance: An organization-change approach. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 4-18.
- Haupt, J. (1992, July). Eldercare: The next frontier in family benefits. *Pension World*, 28(7), 10-13.
- Hayes, L. O. (1993, January). Little Caesars takes care of its own. *Restaurant Hospitality*, 77(1), 58.
- Higgins, C. A., & Duxbury, L. A. (1992). Work-family conflict: A comparison of dual-career and traditional-career men. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(4), 389-411.
- Insurers, drug makers rate high for mothers. (1993, January). *Facilities design and management*, 12(1), 14.
- Jones, M. (1993, November). Giving family leave a checkup. *Working Woman*, p. 17.
- Klein, E. (1991, November/December). Is your company "family-friendly"? *D&B Reports*, 39(6), 34-37.
- Laabs, J. J. (1992, November). Ben & Jerry's caring capitalism. *Personnel Journal*, 71(11), 50-57.
- Lee, C. (1991, September). Balancing work and family. *Training*, 28(9), 23-28.
- Lobel, S. A. (1993). A value-laden approach to integrating work and family life. *Human Resource Management*, 31(3), 249-265.
- Losey, M. R. (1992, May). Workplace policies should be family-friendly. *Modern Office Technology*, 37(5), 84-85.
- Louv, R. (1992, Winter). Should corporations care about child care? *Business and Society Review*, pp. 56-64.

- Luciano, L. (1992, June). The good news about employee benefits. *Money*, 21(6), 90-94, 110-112.
- MacBride-King, J., & Paris, H. (1989, Autumn). Balancing work and family responsibilities: Canadian organizations and their family-related problems. *Canadian Business Review*, 16(3), 17-26.
- Maier, M., Thompson, C., & Thomas, C. (1991). Corporate responsiveness (and resistance) to work-family interdependence in the United States. *Equal Opportunities International*, 10(3,4), 25-32.
- Martinez, M. (1990, August). Making room for work/family positions. *HR Magazine*, 35(8), 45-47.
- Martinez, M. N. (1993, January). Family support makes business sense. *HR Magazine*, pp. 38-43.
- Mason, J. C. (1993, February). Publication promotes sharing of work-family policies. *HR Focus*, 70(2), 10.
- Matthes, K. (1992, February). Companies can make it their business to care. *HR Focus*, 69(2), 4-5.
- McCormick, R. D. (1992, May). Family affair. *Chief Executive*, pp. 30-33.
- Michaels, B. (1992, January). Work and family pitfalls. *Executive Excellence*, 9(1), 19.
- Michaels, B., & McCarty, E. (1993, March). Family ties and bottom lines. *Training and Development*, 47(3), 70-72.
- Michaels, B., & Riegel, M. (1990, September). Flexible management. *Executive Excellence*, 7(9), 15-16.
- Mikalachki, A., & Mikalachki, D. (1991, Spring). Work-family issues: You had better address them! *Business Quarterly*, 55(4), 49-52.
- Milliken, F. J., Dutton, J. E., & Beyer, J. M. (1990). Understanding organizational adaptation to change: The case of work-family issues. *Human Resource Planning*, 13(2), 91-107.
- Nelson, D. L., Quick, J. C., & Quick, J. D. (1989, Summer). Corporate warfare: Preventing combat stress and battle fatigue. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(1), 65-79.
- Nelton, S. (1989, March). Six ways to be family friendly. *Nation's Business*, 77(3), 12-13.
- Noble, B. P. (1994, March 20). We're doing just fine, thank you. *New York Times*, Section F, p. 25.
- Nollen, S. D. (1989, May). The work-family dilemma: How HR managers can help. *Personnel*, 66(5), 25-30.
- Orr, E. L. (1991, Fall). Policies for the family-friendly workplace. *Bureaucrat*, 20(3), 5-8.
- Otto, K. L. (1992). Integrated leadership: Tenneco breaks the barriers. *Human Resources Professional*, 4(2), 51-54.
- Overman, S., Thornburg, L., & Martinez, M. (1990, August). Work and family: Vying for time. *HR Magazine*, 35(8), 36-44.
- Phillips, K. F., & Bramson, R. M. (1990). Packaging work/family benefits to create maximum impact. *Compensation and Benefits Management*, 7(1), 86-87.
- Ralston, D. A. (1990, August). How flexitime eases work/family tensions. *Personnel*, 67(8), 45-48.
- Rendero, T. (1990, August). HR panel takes a look ahead. *Personnel*, 67(8), 14-24.
- Sandroff, R. (1989, November). Helping your company become family-friendly. *Working Woman*, 14(11), 136-137, 196-197.
- Schachner, M. (1990, April 2). Colgate wants to be "family friendly." *Business Insurance*, 24(14), 14.

- Schachner, M. (1991, November 25). Work/family benefits grow slowly. *Business Insurance*, 25(47), 3, 12-15.
- Schambers, A. L. (1992, Winter). Flexible employee benefits programs casebook: Steelcase, Inc. *Compensation and Benefits Management*, 9(1), 20-24.
- Schwartz, D. B. (1994). *An examination of the impact of family-friendly policies on the glass ceiling*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Shalowitz, D. (1992a, April 27). Benefits administration. *Business Insurance*, 26(17), 3-6.
- Shalowitz, D. (1992b, April 27). Work/family benefits need not be costly to succeed. *Business Insurance*, 26(17), 10-11.
- Shalowitz, D. (1992c, April 27). Managers named for work-family issues. *Business Insurance*, 26(17), 12.
- Shalowitz, D. (1993, February 1). Employers reap benefits of child care. *Business Insurance*, 27(5), 1, 21.
- Sharpe, R. (1994, March 29). The waiting game: Women make strides, but men stay firmly in top company jobs. *Wall Street Journal*, Section A, pp. 1, 10; Section B, pp. 1, 5.
- Shelley, S. (1992, April). Balancing work and family. *Chemical Engineering*, 99(4), 147-158.
- Shrinking, changing labor force prompts Johnson & Johnson family issues policies. (1989, September). *Employee Benefit Plan Review*, 44(3), 57-60.
- Smith, B., Michaels, B., & McCarty, E. (1991, September). Back to school, the parent perspective: Corporate cooperation eases conflicts. *Personnel*, 68(9), 1, 3-4.
- Smith, D. M. (1992, March). Company benefits and policies are only a start to becoming "family friendly." *Employee Benefit Plan Review*, 46(9), 10-16.
- Solomon, C. M. (1991, August). 24-hour employees. *Personnel Journal*, 70(8), 56-63.
- Solomon, C. M. (1992, October). Work/family ideas that break boundaries. *Personnel Journal*, 71(10), 112-117.
- Sussman, H. (1990, July/August). Are we talking revolution? *Across the Board*, 27(7,8), 24-26.
- Take care of kids and employees take better care of you. (1989, September). *ABA Banking Journal*, 81(9), 62-68.
- Tarrant, S. M. (1992, January/February). How companies can become more family friendly. *Journal of Compensation and Benefits*, 7(4), 18-21.
- Thompson, K. D. (1991, May). The executive parent survival guide. *Black Enterprise*, 21(10), 40-54.
- Thornburg, L. (1993, January). Progressive employers wrestle with elder-care benefits. *HR Magazine*, 38(1), 50.
- Today's worker in tomorrow's workplace: An interview with TRW Inc.'s Pat Choate. (1990, July/August). *Journal of Business Strategy*, 11(4), 4-7.
- Verespej, M. A. (1992, June 15). Face time's importance fading away. *Industry Week*, pp. 12-18.
- Wagel, W. H. (1990, January). On the horizon: HR in the 1990s. *Personnel*, 67(1), 10-16.
- Wallace, C. (1992, February). Creating a family-friendly workplace. *Credit Union Management*, 15(2), 18-21.
- Weber, J. (1991, June 24). Meet DuPont's "in-house conscience." *Business Week*, pp. 62, 65.
- Women in accountancy: Part-time and family-friendly. (1992, October). *Accountancy*, 110(1190), 66.

- Woodruff, J. (1990, July/August). What do employees really want? *Across the Board*, 27(7,8), 14-21.
- Woolsey, C. (1992, September 14). Continued growth seen in work-family benefits. *Business Insurance*, 26(37), 13, 16.
- Work and the family. (1992). *Association Management*, 44(9), 16.
- Work-family balance. (1991, November). *Executive Excellence*, 8(11), 17.
- Workplace flexibility: A strategy for doing business*. (1993). Boston: Work/Family Directions.

Appendix B: Organizational Assessment Tools

ASSESSMENT 1

SYMPTOMS OF TIME AND ENERGY IMBALANCE

Place a check mark next to the items that describe you.

- ☐ I bring work home on the weekends.
- ☐ I continue working after my co-workers have quit and gone home.
- ☐ I put more thought into my work than I do into my personal life relationships.
- ☐ I eat on the run.
- ☐ I don't have enough time to stay on a consistent exercise program.
- ☐ I get an adrenalin "high" from dealing with pressures and challenges at work.
- ☐ I'm more diplomatic with co-workers than I am with family members.
- ☐ I find myself thinking about work while I am engaged in leisure activities.
- ☐ I prefer working to engaging in leisure activities.
- ☐ I keep promising my family that I will cut down on working, but I don't do so.
- ☐ I get more recognition and respect at work than I do at home.
- ☐ I feel overloaded by all the roles I play in my life.
- ☐ My organization demands a lot of work out of me.
- ☐ The more work I have on my plate, the more I thrive.
- ☐ I work harder when things are unsatisfying in my personal life.
- ☐ I worry about my health.
- ☐ I worry about the consequences for my kids of the moves we've made and my long hours.
- ☐ By and large, my worklife is more exciting than my personal life.
- ☐ I feel it's my responsibility to provide for my family, even if it means long hours.
- ☐ I don't have too much in common with other members of my family.
- ☐ I don't spend much time in conversations and interactions with family and friends.
- ☐ My family has adjusted to the pressures of my work.
- ☐ I like it when my hard work is recognized by an increase in responsibility.
- ☐ I feel good in my outside life because of my work position and status.

What proportion of the above items did you check? When you look at the items you checked, what is the message you get? Does it tell you your time and energy are out of balance?

Source: *Balancing Act: How Managers Can Integrate Successful Careers and Fulfilling Personal Lives*, by Joan Kofodimos. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993. Reprinted with permission.

ASSESSMENT 2

SYMPTOMS OF THE COMPETITIVE-CONTROL APPROACH

Place a check mark next to the items that describe you.

- ☐ I spend most of my time and energy working.
- ☐ After the excitement in my job, my personal life sometimes seems uneventful.
- ☐ I feel guilty when I am goofing off instead of accomplishing things, even on the weekends.
- ☐ When I go on vacation, I schedule every moment with activities.
- ☐ When I play sports or games with my friends, I play to win.
- ☐ I get impatient when I have to wait in line or in traffic.
- ☐ I like to take charge and help others manage their affairs, even in my own family.
- ☐ I get frustrated with people when they don't live up to my standards.
- ☐ I get upset with myself when I make mistakes.
- ☐ I don't like to do things at which I'm unskilled.
- ☐ When I spend time with my partner or children, I like to have a goal or project to work on.
- ☐ Most of the people I see socially are people I have met through work.
- ☐ My family and friends don't always see the real me.
- ☐ I don't like to burden others with my doubts and worries.
- ☐ I often seem to be in a hurry and pressured by deadlines.
- ☐ I push myself too hard and exhaust myself.
- ☐ I take on too many projects and commitments.
- ☐ I prefer to do things myself rather than ask for help.
- ☐ I like to do things my way, and my way is often right.
- ☐ When things aren't going well in my personal life, I throw myself into my work.
- ☐ When I sense tension between myself and my spouse or partner, I prefer to avoid it.

Look back on the check marks you gave. What does the total number, and the pattern of items you checked, tell you? How do you react to seeing this self-description?

Source: *Balancing Act: How Managers Can Integrate Successful Careers and Fulfilling Personal Lives*, by Joan Kofodimos. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993. Reprinted with permission.

ASSESSMENT 3 SYMPTOMS OF SELF-IDEALIZATION

Place a check mark next to the items that describe you.

- ☐ I like people to know that I have a respected position in my organization.
- ☐ I like to convey a certain image of myself to others.
- ☐ When things go wrong, I tend to look around for the culprit.
- ☐ I want to move up in my organization.
- ☐ I sometimes demonstrate some personality traits that I don't particularly like.
- ☐ I have a lot of willpower, and I can control my feelings.
- ☐ I prefer not to introspect; I'd rather focus on action in the external world.
- ☐ If my organization really valued me, they would promote me to a higher level.
- ☐ I admire many of my senior managers and would like to become more like them.
- ☐ I want my bosses to think highly of me.
- ☐ Part of my job is to carry out duties I don't particularly enjoy or value.
- ☐ Sometimes I think the people above me in the organization have all the power.
- ☐ Doing well in my work and career helps me feel good about myself.

ASSESSMENT 4

ORGANIZATIONAL EXPECTATIONS REGARDING TIME AND ENERGY

Put a plus sign (+) next to items on the following list that are positively valued in your organization or that represent desirable qualities in managers. Put a minus sign (–) next to items that are negatively valued in your organization or that represent undesirable qualities in managers.

You may want to respond to the items twice, once regarding what you think is expected of you by others in the organization, and once regarding what you expect of others in the organization.

Another way to respond to these items is to ask yourself which items best describe a person who does well in this organization.

Imbalanced Commitment (focus on work)

- ☐ Keeping a "full plate"—a heavy, stressful workload
- ☐ Consistently spending long hours at the office
- ☐ Traveling to and from work destinations on weekends
- ☐ Giving work obligations first priority over personal obligations
- ☐ Preserving a family structure whose demands are minimal (for example, a male having a traditional spouse or a female remaining single or childless)
- ☐ Accepting work-related phone calls at home on evenings and weekends
- ☐ Doing work at home regularly
- ☐ Accepting frequent transfers and promotions that require geographical moves

Balanced Commitment (focus on work and personal life)

- ☐ Talking about personal life at work
- ☐ Refusing for personal reasons transfers or promotions requiring geographical moves
- ☐ Starting a family—becoming pregnant or adopting a child
- ☐ Going home during the workday to attend to personal life responsibilities, such as a sick child
- ☐ Taking an extended parental leave
- ☐ Setting limits on hours spent at work
- ☐ Using alternate work designs, such as flextime/flexplace
- ☐ Taking your full vacation allotment
- ☐ Preserving a family structure that demands commitment (for example, dual careers, children)

Do the pluses and minuses reveal any patterns? What does this signify about prevailing norms in your organization regarding the investment of time and energy in work?

What similarities and differences do you find in what is expected of you and what you expect of others? To what extent have you been a carrier of organizational norms regarding the investment of time and energy in work?

Source: *Balancing Act: How Managers Can Integrate Successful Careers and Fulfilling Personal Lives*, by Joan Kofodimos. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993. Reprinted with permission.

ASSESSMENT 5

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FOR COMPETITIVE-CONTROL OR COLLABORATIVE-CONNECTED APPROACH

Which of these characteristics are demonstrated by managers and executives in your organization?

1. Choose one item in each horizontal row that characterizes the "typical" manager's approach. Put a "T" next to that item.
2. Choose one item in each horizontal row that characterizes the "best," most effective, or highest potential manager's approach. Put a "B" next to that item.

Competitive-Control Characteristics

☐ Suppress unacceptable parts of self

☐ Judge others

☐ Use instrumental approach towards others

☐ Use aggressive energy

☐ Impose standards on others

☐ Push for results and closure

☐ Maintain interpersonal distance

☐ Emphasize rationality, seriousness

☐ Strive to be autonomous, in charge

Collaborative-Connected Characteristics

☐ Accept all of self

☐ Accept all of others

☐ Seek intimacy

☐ Trust others

☐ Seek interdependence

☐ Use process skills

☐ Accept limits of individual influence

☐ Maintain own and others' integrity

☐ Support individual growth needs

In which columns do the characteristics of "typical" and "best" managers tend to cluster? What does this suggest about the valued and predominant leadership/management profile in your organization?

Source: *Balancing Act: How Managers Can Integrate Successful Careers and Fulfilling Personal Lives*, by Joan Kofodimos. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993. Reprinted with permission.

ASSESSMENT 6

CULTURAL PRACTICES SHAPING SELF-IDEALIZATION VERSUS SELF-REALIZATION

Place a tick mark next to the statement in each horizontal row that best describes your organization's culture (either self-idealizing or self-realizing).

	<i>Self-idealizing Culture</i>	<i>Self-realizing Culture</i>
Performance Standards:		
Employee voice/input into performance criteria	— Work design, goals, and measurements are engineered by managers or experts. — Changes in roles, structures, and demands are engineered by managers or experts.	— Individuals have input into their work design, goals, and measurements. — Individuals have input into changes in roles, structures, and demands affecting them.
Influence, efficacy, control	— Outcomes on which individuals are measured are affected by variables out of their control. — Measures and standards are defined by managers or experts, not the individual. — Performance expectations are changed without providing coaching and training.	— Individuals have influence over outcomes on which they are being measured. — Individuals are involved in the definition of measures and standards for their work. — Individuals get coaching and training to fulfill changed performance expectations.
Clarity of communication of performance expectations	— Espoused performance standards differ from actual ones. — Individuals are faced with conflicting performance expectations and standards. — Changes in performance expectations are vague. — Individuals do not understand their role in supporting overall company goals and strategies.	— Espoused performance standards are consistent with actual ones. — There is consistency among the performance expectations or standards placed on individuals. — Changes in role expectations are clearly explained. — Individuals understand their role in supporting overall company goals and strategies.
Clarity of feedback regarding performance and potential	— People lack clear and accurate feedback about their career future. — People lack clear and accurate feedback about current performance.	— People get clear and accurate feedback about their career future. — People get clear and accurate feedback about current performance.

ASSESSMENT 6 (cont.)

	<i>Self-idealizing Culture</i>	<i>Self-realizing Culture</i>
Value placed on integrity versus conformity	— Constructive disagreement with organizational policies or decisions is suppressed. — People focus on managing impressions.	— Constructive disagreement with organizational policies or decisions is encouraged. — People focus on accomplishing the work.
<i>Career Models and Systems:</i>		
Career development values	— Career development process emphasizes vertical advancement.	— Career development emphasizes individual talents and growth.
Succession planning emphasis	— Assessment and development focus on predetermined skills and competencies for target positions.	— Assessment and development are tailored to desired competencies derived from individual goals.
Individual role in succession planning	— Succession planning is a centralized activity that involves individuals only after a target position is identified.	— People can learn of potential position vacancies, participate in evaluating them, and identify their preferences.
Career track alternatives and flexibility	— Career progress is defined as a progression to broader management responsibilities and higher hierarchical levels. — Parallel career tracks are not available.	— Career progress is defined according to individual growth needs and can take many forms. — Parallel career tracks are available.
Values and assumptions about success	— People believe that the "best" people are those who want to, and do, make it to the top.	— People believe that success means pursuing individually defined goals and preferences.

Source: *Balancing Act: How Managers Can Integrate Successful Careers and Fulfilling Personal Lives*, by Joan Kofodimos. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993. Reprinted with permission.

ASSESSMENT 7
UNRECOGNIZED COSTS OF MASTERY ORIENTATION

50

IF MORE THAN HALF OF THE ITEMS IN THE NEXT THREE COLUMNS CORRESPONDING TO THIS ASPECT OF MASTERY ORIENTATION ARE CHECKED, CIRCLE THE ASPECT (IT IS PRESENT IN YOUR ORGANIZATION)

PLACE A CHECK NEXT TO EACH OF THE BEHAVIORS IN THIS COLUMN THAT LEADERS IN YOUR ORGANIZATION MANIFEST

PLACE A CHECK NEXT TO EACH OF THE BEHAVIORS OR EXPERIENCES IN THIS COLUMN THAT CHARACTERIZE MEMBERS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION

PLACE A CHECK NEXT TO EACH OF THE OUTCOMES IN THIS COLUMN THAT CHARACTERIZE YOUR ORGANIZATION

Maintain imbalance towards work

- Do not attend to health, well-being, relationships

- Feel forced to overwork

- Burnout: physical, intellectual, emotional

Disown unacceptable parts of self

- Suppress own doubts
- Disregard relevant feelings, intuition
- Disregard data about physical, emotional problems

- Censor questions, doubts
- Censor own feelings, intuition
- Edit or withhold negative data

- Burnout
- Lose important decision data, criteria
- Small problems grow unchecked

Polarize others

- "Halo" and "horns" categorization
- Underutilize talents they don't know how to value

- Censor feelings and behavior viewed as unacceptable
- Overidentify with leader's desires
- Feel misunderstood or mistreated
- Create like-leader/not-like-leader subgroups

- Loss of diverse knowledge and skills
- Homogeneity of viewpoint and skills
- Loss of commitment and energy
- Increased risk of discrimination

Use instrumental approach towards others

- Lack empathy and compassion
- Utilize any means to an end

- Feel objectified, manipulated
- Don't commit discretionary energy

- Reductions in force that are destructive and create survivor syndrome
- Poor development of talent, lack of depth in replacements

Use aggressive energy	• Polarized behavior: bottled up emotions and angry outbursts • Unable, unwilling to tap own emotional data • Lead by anger and fear	• Fear, resentment • Withhold emotions • Intimidated, withhold negative information • Avoid confrontation	• Problems withheld because of "shoot messenger" syndrome • Difficulty getting consensus about highly political issues • Low-level emotions (like anxiety) lost as sources of insight
Impose standards on others	• Perfectionist • Demanding	• Stress, resentment • No opportunity to generate own standards	• No internalized accountability for decisions and actions
Push for results and closure	• Focus on short-term outcomes • Impatient with process • Lack process skills • Avoid considering risks and options • Devalue others' input	• Pressured for decisions • Feel underutilized • Censor opinions and ideas • Withhold vital decision-making information	• Neglect of long-term consequences • Inability to diagnose process-based problems • Key information not factored into decisions • Costly recycling through decision-making process • Inflexible plans
Maintain interpersonal distance	• Don't express doubts • Aloof, distant, superficially personable • Don't ask for or accept help • Assume demeanor of self-sufficiency, arrogance	• Don't feel need or opportunity to provide help, ideas, support • Are mistrustful	• Overconfident decisions don't consider risks • Decisions don't utilize all information
Emphasize rationality, seriousness	• Don't use intuitive or emotional data in making decisions • Don't form comfortable working relationships • Don't express praise, appreciation to others • Don't play with ideas or encourage creative slack • Don't consider human impact of decisions	• Forced to censor own emotions, intuition • Uncomfortable with leader • Feel undervalued, unappreciated • Lose opportunity for creative banter • Demoralized • Resist, disagree with decisions	• Decisions miss nonrational data • No internalized accountability for decisions and actions • Implementation delays and difficulties due to reluctance, resistance, malicious compliance, sabotage

ASSESSMENT 7 (cont.)

52

IF MORE THAN HALF OF THE ITEMS IN THE NEXT THREE COLUMNS CORRESPONDING TO THIS ASPECT OF MASTERY ORIENTATION ARE CHECKED, CIRCLE THE ASPECT (IT IS PRESENT IN YOUR ORGANIZATION)

PLACE A CHECK NEXT TO EACH OF THE BEHAVIORS IN THIS COLUMN THAT LEADERS IN YOUR ORGANIZATION MANIFEST

PLACE A CHECK NEXT TO EACH OF THE BEHAVIORS OR EXPERIENCES IN THIS COLUMN THAT CHARACTERIZE MEMBERS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION

PLACE A CHECK NEXT TO EACH OF THE OUTCOMES IN THIS COLUMN THAT CHARACTERIZE YOUR ORGANIZATION

Strive to be autonomous, in charge

- Won't admit mistakes, accept input
- Can't acknowledge risks of own behavior or alternatives
- Won't delegate substantive matters
- Unwilling to share authority
- Micro-manage
- Anxious when not controlling

- Not heard, utilized
- Withhold ideas and motivation
- Disempowered
- Intimidated

- Dissenting ideas not incorporated into decisions
- Ideas not generated by those who know work best
- Decisions, information, and power concentrated in leader
- Few checks on bad decisions
- Learned helplessness

Emphasis on competing, winning

- Want to beat others, put need to win above other goals
- Don't relinquish good staffers for their own career progress
- Don't give others credit
- Don't cooperate with peers

- Don't cooperate with leader
- Feel forced to take sides
- Demotivated
- Miss developmental opportunities
- Competitive response to leader
- Resent leader's credit-stealing

- Broader organizational objectives are sub-optimized
- No alignment around shared goals
- Counterproductive focus on competition
- Collaborative opportunities missed

Identification with organization goals

- Adopt organizational values, personal values undeveloped
- Base ethical judgments on career benefits
- Fail to challenge organizational objectives and methods

- Mistrust
- Expect self-serving decisions

- Ethical problems in decision making
- Organizational follies go undetected

Identification with superiors' whims, upward orientation

- Seek to please superiors at expense of others' needs

- Experience leader as disloyal and unsupportive

- Decreased performance, commitment among career "losers" and staffers

APPENDIX C: SAMPLE INTERVENTIONS TOWARDS THE BALANCED CULTURE

The following interventions are examples of specific tactics and design process in five areas of organizational practice: work design and staffing; measurement, compensation, and incentives; performance management; training and development; and career development.

Work Design and Staffing

- Have all members conduct a personal assessment of beliefs about mastery. Then have members conduct a personal audit, with others' support and input, to identify time spent on mastery-oriented activities that waste organization resources or create little customer value (for instance, multiple-level project reviews, multi-period/multi-level budget reviews, and large-scale staff meetings).
- Have work teams conduct a team assessment of beliefs about mastery and then conduct a team audit to identify time spent on mastery-oriented activities that waste organization resources or create little customer value.
- Have the senior management team conduct an organizational assessment of beliefs about mastery and then conduct an organizational audit to identify time spent on mastery-oriented activities that waste organization resources or create little customer value.
- Clarify the organization's core competence for value creation, with a team representing all members. Define the critical skills which comprise that core competence. Communicate core competence information to all members.
- Redesign all work processes collaboratively with all members to optimize value creation. Reassign members to those processes collaboratively based on aptitude and interest.
- Clarify all role and performance expectations collaboratively with the member having primary responsibility for establishing these in a self-directed manner.

- Have members evaluate all processes and eliminate low value activities. Allocate a portion of newly available time to the pursuit of life balance and a portion to process improvement.
- Identify sources and costs of internal error, waste, safety, or legal/ethical issues with causes related to mastery-driven leader behavior. Collaboratively identify and implement solutions.
- Utilize self-selection staffing processes, where individual members match themselves with existing jobs or propose new roles, based on the best fit with their skills and interests and with needed contributions.
- Utilize nontraditional staffing models (for instance, job sharing and flextime) as appropriate.
- Establish policies supporting time boundaries (for instance, discourage phone calls or faxes to individuals' homes after hours; discourage scheduling out-of-town meetings requiring weekend travel).
- Have members collaboratively identify and establish work design and staffing strategies which will enable individuals to take temporary leaves for sabbaticals or personal reasons without penalty to them (for instance, cross-training, flexible teams).

Measurements, Compensation, and Incentives

- Eliminate disproportionate managerial compensation which reinforces self-idealization and imbalance.
- Implement measures which track valued outputs and the actions which create them. Design these measures collaboratively with all members represented. Eliminate any measure of individual performance not related to value creation (for instance, seniority, work hours, and volume).
- Conduct discussions with members to identify how existing measures support mastery-oriented behaviors, and revise these measures accordingly.

- Implement compensation systems based solely on value creation (for instance, contribution of individual outputs to total value creation, and development of value-producing skills). Design these systems collaboratively with all members represented. Eliminate any basis for compensation not related to value creation (for instance, seniority, perceived market value, span of control, and resources managed).
- Conduct discussions with members to identify how compensation systems support mastery-oriented behaviors, and revise these systems accordingly.
- Establish organizational incentives for modeling, training, and enabling life balance consistent with optimal contribution.
- Establish organizational incentives for individuals to jointly optimize life balance and contribution to organizational value.
- Establish self-directed systems for reinforcing balance and for determining balance-related rewards.
- Collaboratively determine consequences for low value performance.

Performance Management

- Create expectations for self-directed performance and self-directed teams. Provide the training and support needed to implement these expectations.
- Develop performance management systems which support self-direction.
- Create expectations for, train, coach, and reinforce a collaborative-connected leadership approach.
- Create expectations for an appraisal process which is self-directed, collaborative, focused on value creation and its related behaviors and skills, and which examines balance-related issues.
- Collaboratively develop and implement performance feedback methods which are self-directed and focus on value creation and personal development through work and nonwork.

- Collaboratively develop and implement methods to confront and resolve performance problems when they arise.

Training and Development

- Provide help for individuals to assess gaps in their development and create plans to address those gaps.
- Collectively determine skill gaps, and collaboratively determine, based on personal interests, which members will develop needed skills to support team performance.
- Assess critical skills which must be maintained to support the organization's creation of value, identify a team to monitor and maintain the presence of these skills, collaboratively select members of this team based on aptitude and interest in developing and passing on those skills.
- Implement training to help members self-assess regarding life balance, or conduct collaborative audits of life balance issues before they become crises. Collaboratively plan preventive interventions (in contrast to the palliative approach of employee assistance programs).
- Train work teams to manage life balance and leadership issues within the team and to intervene effectively to prevent or rectify balance-related problems with individuals or the team.
- Train work teams in collaborative-connected behaviors that facilitate their overall team effectiveness.
- Develop policies and practices which encourage training (either inside or outside the organization) on skills which both enhance the organization's core competence and contribute to personal goals.
- Train managers in skills and knowledge needed to jointly optimize individuals' value creation for the organization and their attempts to balance their lives (for instance, helping them set boundaries; encouraging self-care; focusing on results rather than hours; applying policies equitably and flexibly).

- Provide training for individuals on skills that support their development of balance (for instance, managing work-personal life dilemmas; handling stress; setting boundaries).
- Designate coaches who can give ongoing support and feedback in the productive use of collaborative-connected leadership behavior.
- Provide self-awareness training opportunities for individuals (especially executives) to recognize their inner balance issues, how these issues hamper their effectiveness and well-being, and how the entire organization is affected.
- Have senior managers hold informal brown-bag sessions to share their efforts to develop balance, and encourage others to try similar efforts.

Career Development

- Encourage all members to develop and share personal career plans. Reinforce support for individuals pursuing optimal careers whether in or out of the organization.
- Conduct discussions with all members to brainstorm ideas for linking personal career goals to organizational value creation, without any limits of timing, form, organizational status, or job structure.
- Encourage team members to share career plans and collaborate on development activities, especially when they can be linked to value creation or core competence.
- Identify key roles in contributing to the core competence, and develop a pool of skilled members to prepare for those key roles.
- Encourage nontraditional development opportunities (for instance, talent sharing with alliance partners or suppliers, shadow development, simulations or virtual jobs, shared experiences, and experience-specific role substitution) which support value creation, life balance, and personal development.

- Encourage activities which optimize both performance and development (for instance, members practicing new skills in support of other members' work, members learning a new skill and then advancing their own development by teaching it to other team members, members performing community service and public relations simultaneously).
- Support independent entrepreneurial ventures which provide individual development and also expand organizational core competence and value creation.
- Establish mechanisms to provide individuals with realistic feedback regarding their contribution and capability.
- Establish alternative career tracks such as technical ladders.
- Provide opportunities for within-job development such as task forces, job expansion, or special assignments.
- Provide and encourage lateral movement opportunities that fit with individuals' interests and developmental needs.
- Establish interactive processes for transfer and promotion decisions that involve members' families.
- Provide relocation seminars for individuals and their families.
- Provide relocation and job-seeking assistance for family members.
- Establish a sabbatical policy that allows individuals to pursue their interests and goals and also builds their skills, knowledge, and potential contribution to the organization.

CENTER FOR CREATIVE LEADERSHIP PUBLICATIONS

SELECTED REPORTS:

Beyond Work-Family Programs J.R. Kofodimos (1995, Stock No. 167R)	\$25.00
CEO Selection: A Street-Smart Review G.P. Hollenbeck (1994, Stock #164R)	\$25.00
Character Shifts: The Challenge of Improving Executive Performance Through Personal Growth R.E. Kaplan (1990, Stock #143R)	\$30.00
Coping With an Intolerable Boss M.M. Lombardo & M.W. McCall, Jr. (1984, Stock #305R)	\$10.00
The Creative Opportunists: Conversations with the CEOs of Small Businesses J.S. Bruce (1992, Stock #316R)	\$12.00
Creativity in the R&D Laboratory T.M. Amabile & S.S. Grysiewicz (1987, Stock #130R)	\$12.00
The Dynamics of Management Derailment M.M. Lombardo & C.D. McCauley (1988, Stock #134R)	\$12.00
Eighty-eight Assignments for Development in Place: Enhancing the Developmental Challenge of Existing Jobs M.M. Lombardo & R.W. Eichinger (1989, Stock #136R)	\$15.00
Enhancing 360-degree Feedback for Senior Executives: How to Maximize the Benefits and Minimize the Risks R.E. Kaplan & C.J. Palus (1994, Stock #160R)	\$15.00
An Evaluation of the Outcomes of a Leadership Development Program C.D. McCauley & M.W. Hughes-James (1994, Stock #163R)	\$35.00
The Expansive Executive (Second Edition) R.E. Kaplan (1991, Stock #147R)	\$25.00
Feedback to Managers, Volume I: A Guide to Evaluating Multi-rater Feedback Instruments E. Van Velsor & J. Brittain Leslie (1991, Stock #149R)	\$20.00
Feedback to Managers, Volume II: A Review and Comparison of Sixteen Multi-rater Feedback Instruments E. Van Velsor & J. Brittain Leslie (1991, Stock #150R)	\$80.00
Gender Differences in the Development of Managers: How Women Managers Learn From Experience E. Van Velsor & M. W. Hughes (1990, Stock #145R)	\$35.00
High Hurdles: The Challenge of Executive Self-Development R.E. Kaplan, W.H. Drath, & J.R. Kofodimos (1985, Stock #125R)	\$15.00
The Intuitive Pragmatists: Conversations with Chief Executive Officers J.S. Bruce (1986, Stock #310R)	\$12.00
Key Events in Executives' Lives E.H. Lindsey, V. Homes, & M.W. McCall, Jr. (1987, Stock #132R)	\$65.00
Learning How to Learn From Experience: Impact of Stress and Coping K.A. Bunker & A.D. Webb (1992, Stock #154R)	\$30.00
Making Common Sense: Leadership as Meaning-making in a Community of Practice W.H. Drath & C.J. Palus (1994, Stock #156R)	\$15.00
Off the Track: Why and How Successful Executives Get Derailed M.W. McCall, Jr., & M.M. Lombardo (1983, Stock #121R)	\$10.00
Preventing Derailment: What To Do Before It's Too Late M.M. Lombardo & R.W. Eichinger (1989, Stock #138R)	\$25.00
Readers' Choice: A Decade of <i>Issues & Observations</i> W.H. Drath, Editor (1990, Stock #314R)	\$15.00
The Realities of Management Promotion M.N. Ruderman & P.J. Ohlott (1994, Stock #157R)	\$20.00
Redefining What's Essential to Business Performance: Pathways to Productivity, Quality, and Service L.R. Sayles (1990, Stock #142R)	\$20.00
Training for Action: A New Approach to Executive Development R.M. Burnside & V.A. Guthrie (1992, Stock #153R)	\$15.00
Traps and Pitfalls in the Judgment of Executive Potential M.N. Ruderman & P. J. Ohlott (1990, Stock #141R)	\$20.00
Twenty-two Ways to Develop Leadership in Staff Managers R.W. Eichinger & M.M. Lombardo (1990, Stock #144R)	\$15.00
Understanding Executive Performance: A Life-Story Perspective C.J. Palus, W. Nasby, & R.D. Easton (1991, Stock #148R)	\$20.00
Upward-communication Programs in American Industry A.I. Kraut & F.H. Freeman (1992, Stock #152R)	\$30.00
Why Executives Lose Their Balance J.R. Kofodimos (1989, Stock #137R)	\$20.00
Why Managers Have Trouble Empowering: A Theoretical Perspective Based on Concepts of Adult Development W.H. Drath (1993, Stock #155R)	\$15.00

SELECTED BOOKS:

Balancing Act: How Managers Can Integrate Successful Careers and Fulfilling Personal Lives	
J.R. Kofodimos (1993, Stock #247R)	\$27.00
Beyond Ambition: How Driven Managers Can Lead Better and Live Better R.E. Kaplan,	
W.H. Drath, & J.R. Kofodimos (1991, Stock #227R)	\$29.95
Breaking the Glass Ceiling: Can Women Reach the Top of America's Largest Corporations?	
(Updated Edition) A.M. Morrison, R.P. White, & E. Van Velsor (1992, Stock #236R)	\$19.95
Choosing to Lead K.E. Clark & M.B. Clark (1994, Stock #249R)	\$35.00
Developing Diversity in Organizations: A Digest of Selected Literature A.M. Morrison &	
K.M. Crabtree (1992, Stock #317R)	\$25.00
Discovering Creativity: Proceedings of the 1992 International Creativity and Innovation	
Networking Conference S.S. Gryskiewicz (Ed.) (1993, Stock #319R)	\$30.00
Executive Selection: A Look at What We Know and What We Need to Know	
D.L. DeVries (1993, Stock #321R)	\$20.00
Healing the Wounds: Overcoming the Trauma of Layoffs and Revitalizing Downsized	
Organizations D.M. Noer (1993, Stock #245R)	\$26.00
If I'm In Charge Here, Why Is Everybody Laughing? D.P. Campbell (1980, Stock #205R)	\$9.40
If You Don't Know Where You're Going You'll Probably End Up Somewhere Else	
D.P. Campbell (1974, Stock #203R)	\$8.95
Impact of Leadership K.E. Clark, M.B. Clark, & D.P. Campbell (Eds.) (1992, Stock #235R)	\$59.50
Inklings: Collected Columns on Leadership and Creativity D.P. Campbell (1992, Stock #233R)	\$15.00
Leadership Education 1994-1995: A Source Book F.H. Freeman, K.B. Knott, &	
M.K. Schwartz (Eds.) (1994, Stock #322R)	\$59.00
Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience R.L. Hughes, R.C. Ginnett, & G.J. Curphy	
(1992, Stock #246R)	\$40.95
The Lessons of Experience: How Successful Executives Develop on the Job M.W. McCall, Jr.,	
M.M. Lombardo, & A.M. Morrison (1988, Stock #211R)	\$22.95
Making Diversity Happen: Controversies and Solutions A.M. Morrison, M.N. Ruderman, &	
M. Hughes-James (1993, Stock #320R)	\$25.00
Measures of Leadership K.E. Clark & M.B. Clark (Eds.) (1990, Stock #215R)	\$59.50
The New Leaders: Guidelines on Leadership Diversity in America A.M. Morrison	
(1992, Stock #238R)	\$29.00
Performance Appraisal on the Line D.L. DeVries, A.M. Morrison, S.L. Shullman, &	
M.L. Gerlach (1981, Stock #206R)	\$15.00
Readings in Innovation S.S. Gryskiewicz & D.A. Hills (Eds.) (1992, Stock #240R)	\$25.00
Take the Road to Creativity and Get Off Your Dead End D.P. Campbell (1977, Stock #204R)	\$8.95
Whatever It Takes: The Realities of Managerial Decision Making (Second Edition)	
M.W. McCall, Jr., & R.E. Kaplan (1990, Stock #218R)	\$30.40
The Working Leader: The Triumph of High Performance Over Conventional Management	
Principles L.R. Sayles (1993, Stock #243R)	\$24.95

SPECIAL PACKAGES:

Conversations with CEOs (includes 310R & 316R)	\$16.00
Development & Derailment (includes 136R, 138R, & 144R)	\$30.00
The Diversity Collection (includes 145R, 236R, 238R, 317R, & 320R)	\$85.00
Executive Selection Package (includes 141R, 321R, & 157R)	\$32.00
Feedback to Managers: Volumes I & II (includes 149R & 150R)	\$85.00
Personal Growth, Taking Charge, and Enhancing Creativity (includes 203R, 204R, & 205R)	\$20.00

Discounts are available. Please write for a comprehensive Publication & Products Catalog. Address your request to: Publication, Center for Creative Leadership, P.O. Box 26300, Greensboro, NC 27438-6300, 910-545-2805, or fax to 910-545-3221. All prices subject to change.

0395

ORDER FORM

Name _____ Title _____

Organization _____

Mailing Address _____

(street address required for mailing)

City/State/Zip _____

Telephone _____ FAX _____

(telephone number required for UPS mailing)

Quantity	Stock No.	Title	Unit Cost	Amount
Subtotal				
Shipping and Handling (add 6% of subtotal with a \$4.00 minimum; add 40% on all international shipping)				
All NC Residents add 6% sales tax				
TOTAL				

METHOD OF PAYMENT

☐ Check or money order enclosed (payable to Center for Creative Leadership).

☐ Purchase Order No. _____ (Must be accompanied by this form.)

☐ Charge my order, plus shipping, to my credit card:

☐ American Express ☐ Discover ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

ACCOUNT NUMBER: _____ EXPIRATION DATE: MO. ____ YR. ____

NAME OF ISSUING BANK: _____

SIGNATURE _____

☐ Please put me on your mailing list.

☐ Please send me the Center's quarterly newsletter, *Issues & Observations*.

**Publication • Center for Creative Leadership • P.O. Box 26300
Greensboro, NC 27438-6300
910-545-2805 • FAX 910-545-3221**

fold here

PLACE
STAMP
HERE

CENTER FOR CREATIVE LEADERSHIP
PUBLICATION
P. O. Box 26300
Greensboro, NC 27438-6300

BEYOND WORK-FAMILY PROGRAMS

CONFRONTING AND RESOLVING THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF WORK-PERSONAL LIFE CONFLICT

The conflict that many people experience between their work and personal lives has received a lot of attention in recent years. Organizations have attempted to alleviate this conflict by establishing work-family programs, or WFPs, that address such issues as child-care assistance, parental leave, elder care, flexible working arrangements, wellness and fitness, and stress management. The existence of such programs is a tangible acknowledgment of the seriousness of the conflict and of the challenges that it poses for individual well-being and organizational effectiveness. The problem is, WFPs are not working very well. They provide some assistance to some people, but most programs are not widely used and potential beneficiaries often view them with indifference or even resentment. This report offers an explanation for the failure of WFPs and suggests how they can be reconceptualized to be an important part of a broader effort to create organizations that support a balance between work and personal life.

The Author

Joan R. Kofodimos is a partner in The Renaissance Group, a consulting partnership in Durham, North Carolina, that focuses on human and organizational development. With a Ph.D. in organizational behavior from Yale University, she is a coauthor of *Beyond Ambition: How Driven Managers Can Lead Better and Live Better* (1991, Jossey-Bass) and author of *Balancing Act: How Managers Can Integrate Successful Careers and Fulfilling Personal Lives* (1993, Jossey-Bass).



CENTER FOR CREATIVE LEADERSHIP®

